The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

THE GUIDANCE OF JESUS FOR TO-DAY

THE GUIDANCE OF JESUS FOR TO-DAY:

BEING AN ACCOUNT OF THE TEACHING OF JESUS FROM THE STANDPOINT OF MODERN PERSONAL AND SOCIAL NEED *By*

CECIL JOHN CADOUX, M.A., D.D.

AUTHOR OF "THE EARLY CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TO WAR"

NEW YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY
1921

ARTHURO

FRATRI ET AMICO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Theologians of a certain school have almost resented the attempt to present Christ the Teacher, as if it were better for Christian thought to be busied with His work than with His words. But what without His teaching would His Person and death signify? Are they not mutally necessary, reciprocally explicative? Would not His teaching be aimless without His death? Does not His death grow luminous only as He Himself is made its interpreter? His words have been a sort of infinite wonder to the world, a kind of Divine heart and conscience to it. They are but few; we can read in an hour all of His thought that survives in the forms human art has created to clothe and immortalize the human spirit. Nor was He careful to preserve them, wrote no word, commanded no word to be written; spoke, as it were, into the listening air the words it was to hear and preserve for all time. And the speech thus spoken into the air has been like a sweet and subtle Divine essence in the heart of humanity."

A. M. FAIRBAIRN, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 189.

INTRODUCTION

One does not need to be a Jeremiah in order to feel oppressed and distressed by the general conditions of human life to-day. Look where we will, it is hard to find much solid ground for cheerfulness and optimism. The Great War, which was to have ended war and ushered in the Kingdom of God, has bequeathed to us a heritage of suffering and confusion and embitterment, which will take us a century at least to remove, and which threatens to involve us in several wars long before that century elapses. Our Achan has gone, but the accursed thing remains. Everywhere there is unrest and dissatisfaction and mutual recrimination over political and industrial grievances. The Press records its full daily toll of private folly and iniquity. The Christian Church, the body to which belongs of natural right the task of moral inspiration and leadership, is coming to realize more acutely than ever her powerlessness to deal adequately with the enormous problems that face her. It is not true, indeed, as some would have us believe, that the churches are dead. There is very much in their life and work to be proud of and thankful for: and it may be that much of the feeling of depression prevalent in Christian circles to-day is due to the natural tendency of all idealists to exaggerate their

own shortcomings. As Coventry Patmore said: "Christianity has always appeared to her contemporaries to be in a state of decay." But when every allowance for such self-depreciation has been made, the recent discovery that not more than twenty per cent. of the manhood of the country have any real attachment to, knowledge of, or contact with, organized Christianity,[1] cannot but be felt as

[1] It had long been known that the number of professed Christians —or at least, of church-going Christians—in this country was a good deal smaller than it ought to be and than it formerly had been. But we have recently had fresh light thrown on the actual condition of things in the shape of a thorough investigation into the state of religion in the British Army engaged in the recent war. The enquiry was undertaken by a large and representative committee of religious leaders; and the reports thus collected are quoted and summarized on behalf of this committee by Dr. D. S. Cairns, in *The Army and Religion* (Macmillan, 1919). A number of passages from this book will be seen to bear out the statement in the text.

First, in regard to the extent to which the Army is representative in religious matters of the population as a whole. "It may be well maintained that the attitude of the Army to-day towards religion is fairly indicative of the normal attitude of the British people as a whole toward religion" (p. 24). "In all this the Army is simply a reflex of average opinion at home, as everyone who is acquainted with average public opinion is well aware. The Christian ideal and interpretation of national life are simply not in possession" (p. 337). "Nothing can surely be clearer than that the great world of to-day is not governed by Christian standards, and for the want of them has come, for the time, to confusion" (p. 324).

Next, in regard to the actual conditions in the Army, I have noted some thirty odd passages (of various lengths) in the book, testifying to the poverty of religious knowledge and attainment among the soldiers. See pp. 10 ("The religion of ninety per cent. of the men at the front is not distinctively Christian"), 24 ("To a very large proportion of the men God Himself means little or nothing"), 34 ("Jesus Christ is, in my opinion, not present to their consciousness, either as an idea or example. They do not think about Him at all, I believe"), 46 f (similar statement by Dr. Cairns in regard to over four-fifths of the men), 60 (Dr. Cairns:

a reproach, or at least as a very grave challenge, to the Church. When we add to this the shame

" The answers . . . are all to the effect that the vast majority are in a condition of ignorance about the Christian religion "), 62 (" The majority have not the foggiest notion of what Christianity is all about "), 69 (similar), 70 (" The great majority had never found themselves compelled to reckon with religion at all "), 78 (" The majority of men think very little about religion "), 80 (" I am convinced that the ' attitude ' of these men before the war was pagan "), 95 (" . . . the mass of men, hitherto out of touch with the Churches "), 108–123 (many similar testimonies, e.g. " the ignorance of the Army in religious matters is colossal " ; " that four out of every five should be lost to the Church is a startling fact "), 144 f (pagan opinion in the Army as to impurity), 177 (the men in the Army " do not seem to know anything about " the Kingdom of God), 189 ff (Dr. Cairns : " It is safe to say that these papers convey the overwhelming conviction that the very large preponderance of the men in the armies have no really living touch with any Church. On this, indeed, there is practical unanimity. . . . ' What percentage of the men, would you say, are in vital relationship with any of the Churches ? ' . . . About four-fifths of all the numerical estimates made in reply to the above question give twenty per cent. and under. . . . We do not base our view of the whole situation on these necessarily imperfect inductions, but on the general cumulative effect of the whole mass of evidence, which certainly bears out the impression that these estimates convey, that three-fourths or four-fifths of the men from England are outside living relationship " (i.e. with the Church), " and that while the situation in Scotland is somewhat better, it is very grave "), 203, 205 (" I should say that 10 per cent. are vitally related to the Church, and 10 per cent. semi-attached "), 209, 217, 221, 223–226, 229, 234, 240, 448 (" ' Everyone must be struck with the appalling ignorance of the simplest religious truths. Probably 80 per cent. of these men from the Midlands have never heard of the Sacraments. . . .' Nor must it be assumed that this ignorance is confined to men who have passed through the elementary schools. The same verdict is recorded upon those who have been educated in our public schools "), 452 (" the 80 per cent. of the manhood of the country at present unreached by any form of organised Christianity ").

I owe my readers an apology for the inordinate length of this note : but I thought it best to let the various witnesses speak for themselves, so that the cumulative effect of their independent testimony might not be missed. As will have been seen, it would

of our disunion,[1] the insufficiency everywhere of the spirit of fellowship, the diminution of our numbers, and the chaotic confusion of our thinking, it is hard to repress feelings of the most serious discontent and the most poignant sorrow. Men everywhere to-day are in the same pitiable state as were the crowds upon whom Jesus had compassion, "because they were worried and bewildered, like sheep without a shepherd."

But man's extremity is God's opportunity. Nothing disposes men more to listen to God's voice and to seek to know His Will, than does the discovery of their own utter need and their inability to meet it out of their own resources. The crying necessity of to-day is a re-discovery of God's Will for the conduct of human life. A time of general discontent is a time for everyone to push his own pet corrective for human ills. Many of the correctives that are being so warmly commended to us in these days may be of very great value: but how can one be sure that any one of them really touches the centre of the problem? At any rate we need some unmistakably radical policy, which clearly goes to the heart of the matter and which will serve as a test to measure the worthiness and promise of every proposed reform. Nothing less than a re-discovery

have been easy to swell the size of the note still further by quoting other passages verbatim; but what has been quoted will suffice to make it clear that, whatever allowance has to be made for the impossibility of obtaining exact statistics, for the larger number of women than of men in the Church, etc, the society in which we live is predominantly unchristian, so far as any conscious profession of Christianity goes.

[1] On the scandal caused to religiously minded outsiders by the divisions of the Church, see *The Army and Religion*, pp. 212–219, 241 f.

of God's Will for human life will satisfy these conditions. And when once that is admitted, the next step is not difficult. What means have we of knowing God's Will? God has not left Himself without witnesses. Guided by the promptings of His Spirit within us, we recognize the expression of His purposes in the world of nature, and in every good life, past and present. But there is One in whom, by the consensus of orthodox and heterodox alike,

> The Great Invisible, by symbols seen,
> Shines with peculiar and concentred light.

In Jesus we have the fullest revelation of that Divine Love and that Divine Law which are less perfectly charactered for us in all human goodness and in all natural beauty. But much as we can learn from these latter, we cannot afford to ignore God's special and unspeakable gift. Our need is so urgent that we dare not give other than the first place in the counsels of our life to Jesus. His touch has still its ancient power.[1] Dean Inge has truly said: "Since there never has been a time when the character of Christ and the ethics which he taught have been held in higher honour than the present, there is every reason to expect that the next 'Age of Faith,' when it comes, will be of a more genuinely Christian type than the last."[2] We say of Jesus what our evangelical fathers said—with a somewhat

[1] "The real miracle, which only escapes our notice because it is so familiar, is the irresistible vitality of the ethical teaching of the Gospel" (F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 27). "History itself has shown that in the main it" (the teaching of Jesus) ". . . is as fresh at the end of eighteen centuries as when first it was delivered" (W. Sanday, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. p. 617A).

[2] *Outspoken Essays*, p. 171.

different reference from theirs, no doubt, but with no less conviction and fervour : " There is salvation in none other : for there is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved," and therefore, " how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation ? " [1]

In face of the magnitude of the issue and of the task it involves, the contribution offered by this little book is a very small and modest one. It is simply an account of the content of Jesus' teaching framed, not on the plan that would commend itself most readily to the scientific critic, but with an eye to the personal needs and duties of the modern Christian disciple, and furnished with such brief comments and elucidations as will, it is hoped, help to make the bearing of this teaching on modern problems somewhat clearer. " It is one of the highest tasks," said Benjamin Jowett, " on which the labour of a life can be spent, to bring the words of Christ a little nearer the heart of man." [2] And it is with the object of doing something towards the fulfilment of that task that the following pages are offered to the public. The substance of them was first put together and delivered in the form of lectures at the invitation of the Ministry Committee of the Society of Friends at York in November and December, 1919. It has however been largely recast and rewritten for publication.

Before, however, we proceed to the details of

[1] Cf Oscar Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus* (ET), p. 527: " That ecclesiastical community will, we cannot doubt, be able to claim a pre-eminence over all others which guides its members nearest to a historical understanding of primitive Christianity, with a view to renewing within itself the primitive Christian ideal of life."

[2] *Essays and Reviews*, p. 380.

our subject, something further must be said in regard to the general relation of Jesus' teaching to modern Christian life. Three views of that relationship are possible: first, that we ought to obey completely and literally all that Jesus said, because he said it; secondly, that we do not need to obey any of it literally, either because we are not under law but under grace, or because, having the Risen Christ within us, we do not need the detailed guidance of the historical Jesus, or for some other reason; and thirdly, that we ought indeed to obey it, but that our obedience is limited in some way. The first of these positions is wrong, because it would give us no right to judge one precept more important than another, to say for instance that it is more important to love God than to cross the Sea of Galilee, for to do so would be to appeal to an authority more fundamental than that of the teaching itself. The second, though held in high quarters, is wrong, because it does not do justice to the immense stress which Jesus laid on men's obedience to his teaching, because it presupposes that the 'Inner Light' dispenses with the necessity for all external guidance, and because, if admitted, the worst acts of unchristian cruelty can be justified.[1]

[1] Compare, e.g. J. F. Bethune-Baker, *The Influence of Christianity on War* (1888), pp. 11 f: "Christ never seems to wish so much to assert a new truth, or a new law, as to impress upon His hearers the spiritual significance of some old truth or law; to raise them altogether *out of the sphere of petty detail* into the life of all-embracing principles; to show them how all depends upon the spirit and the motive of their actions, how *they may do all things* to the glory of God. . . . The theory upon which the Inquisition acted, that physical sufferings are of no moment in comparison with the supreme importance of the spiritual welfare, is quite consonant with the tone of Christ's commands and teaching"

The third also is wrong, if the limits set to our obedience are an arbitrary selection of ill-thought-out claims, such as those of denominational loyalty, fashion, personal convenience, business, patriotism, or obedience to the powers that be. The truth of the matter is surely this: that Divine guidance is a compound of two elements: firstly, an internal and subjective stimulus and check, the 'testimonium Spiritus Sancti' within us, the 'indwelling Christ' of Paul, the 'Inner Light' of the Quaker, the conscience of the ordinary man, which prompts us to seek God's Will and which, however imperfect may be the use we are able to make of it, is yet our ultimate and most fundamental authority in religious and moral matters, because it is the only point where God and ourselves come into *immediate* contact and the only means we have of recognizing the Divine Truth and the Divine Will when they are externally presented to us; and secondly, the external embodiments of the Divine Truth and Will in nature, reason, human goodness, and in Jesus—embodiments which are subject indeed to the certification and the check of the Inner Light, but with which the Inner Light, for all its ultimacy and fundamentality, cannot dispense. The teaching of Jesus has therefore got to be both criticized and obeyed, both sifted and reverently observed: and just as the obligation to obey does not cancel the need for criticism and interpretation, neither ought

(italics mine). For the plea that the apparently mistaken views of Jesus as to the Last Things invalidate his teaching and destroy his infallibility as a guide for modern life, cf Herrmann in *The Social Gospel*, pp. 176–225, and K. Lake, *The Stewardship of Faith*, pp. 43 ff.

the ability to sift and criticize and the duty of doing so to be taken as exempting us from the obligation to obey. As men under authority, it is our business not only to interpret our instructions, but also to *carry them out.*

For the purpose in hand we confine ourselves mainly to the Synoptic Gospels—not because the Fourth Gospel is a romance, but because the discourses it attributes to Jesus are to a large extent framed—in a manner which the literary ethics of the time freely permitted—with an eye rather to doctrinal interests than to historical truth, and it therefore adds but little to our knowledge of what Jesus himself taught. The sayings in the Synoptic Gospels, it is true, are not based on verbatim reports, and they need a good deal of careful examination and criticism. Here and there we have to reject a saying on the ground either of its internal improbability or of its divergence from an apparently more trustworthy parallel.[1] But on the whole the Synoptic sayings go back to reliable personal reminiscence and tradition. Up and down early Christian literature we find a number of sayings ascribed to Jesus which do not occur in our Gospels. These are of all degrees of historical probability, from virtual certainty[2] down to virtual impossibility.[3] We shall have occasion now and then to quote some of these.

This presentation of Jesus' teaching aims at completeness, but only in a certain sense. The

[1] E.g. Mt xii. 40 (see below, p. 145 n 1), and Lc vi. 36, xi. 13 b (compared with Mt v. 48, vii. 11 b).

[2] E.g. Acts xx. 35.

[3] See J. H. Ropes' article 'Agrapha' in Hastings' *DB* v, pp. 343–352, where the literature on the subject is catalogued. Cf also E. Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, pp. 26–31.

reader will not necessarily find every saying that is attributed to him, quoted or discussed or even referred to in these pages. At the same time he has a right to assume that the whole of the material has been examined and that due account has been taken of everything significant for our purpose.[1]

[1] I might explain at this point that words bracketed in a translated passage are those required to make the translation read smoothly, though they have nothing corresponding to them in the original: that the sign || or ||s means the parallel passage or passages in the other Gospels: and that the letters f, ff, mean 'and the following verse(s),' 'page(s),' etc.

The Guidance of Jesus for To-Day

I

THE BEING AND GOODNESS OF GOD

1. JESUS takes *the existence of God* for granted, for the simple reason that none of his contemporaries were concerned to deny it. This fact might seem at the outset a serious defect so far as the modern usefulness of his message is concerned: but it is less so than it seems, for modern doubts about the being of God can be removed, if at all, not by reasons in support of it—one questions whether any agnostic or atheist has ever been helped to believe by the so-called philosophical proofs of God's existence—but by a spiritual experience, which is in essence not intellectual, but ethical and personal. Jesus' contribution to this section of 'Christian evidences' consists, not in any reasons or arguments he advanced, but in the whole impact of his life, words, and death upon the mind and heart of man.

2. *The Fatherhood of God* is the core of Jesus' message and of the Christian Gospel, and the clue that best helps us to unravel the most baffling

problems of human life.[1] The true import of the Divine Fatherhood has been somewhat obscured by the doctrine of the Trinity, which presents "God the Father" to us as primarily the Father, not of His children, but of "God the Son."[2] The modern emphasis on personality and personal relationships is bringing back the message of Jesus to its rights. With the waif in *Bleak House* we confess: "Our Father!—yes, that's wery good, sir."

3. This conception of God as Father crowned and glorified all those *other beliefs about Him* which Jesus learnt from the faith of his people and embraced as the verdict of his own judgment and experience. That faith, in opposition to paganism, declared God to be one, not many,[3] and to be morally perfect, not subject to human faultiness.[4] According to the simple cosmology of the time, it described Him as 'heavenly' or dwelling in heaven[5]—a thought which modern science has deprived of all but a poetical value for us. It was conscious of the unsearchable mystery of the Divine Being[6]: Jesus called God "the Father who is in secret."[7] In keeping with the natural tendency of the Semitic mind to express its sense of the greatness of God by means of a sort

[1] On contemporary Jewish belief in the Fatherhood of God, see O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus* (ET), pp. 99 f, 262, and G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* (ET), pp. 184–189. Dalman shows that the Jews of Jesus' day were familiar with the idea of God being the Father, not of the Chosen Race only, but of the individual member of it.

[2] J. Martineau, *Essays, Reviews, and Addresses*, ii, pp. 530–532.

[3] Deut vi. 4; Mc xii. 29; Mt xxiii. 9.

[4] Zeph iii. 5, etc; Mt v. 48; Mc x. 18 ||s.

[5] Ps cxv. 16; Isa lxvi. 1, etc; Mt v. 34, vi. 9, xxiii. 9, etc. For 'heaven' as a reverent synonym for God, see Dan iv. 26; Lc xv. 18, 21; Mc xi. 30 ||s. Cf Dalman, *op cit*, pp. 92 f, 206, 217 ff.

[6] Deut xxix. 29; Job v. 9, xi. 7; Ps cxlv. 3.

[7] Mt vi. 6, 18.

of religious determinism, it ascribed almightiness to Him in such terms as seem to us to exclude all human initiative and even responsibility.[1] Thus Jesus declares all things to be possible to God,[2] and applies the doctrine, as we shall see, with great frankness and in ways that cause considerable perplexity to a modern Christian's mind.

4. Waiving for the moment this philosophical difficulty, we can see how excellent a ground the doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood proved for what Jesus had to teach men respecting *God's good gifts*. It is the fulcrum that gives him his great leverage. Along with its implication of the sameness of righteousness in God and in men, it often furnishes him with a basis for a form of argument, of which he was extremely fond—the 'argument a fortiori,' the deduction, that is, of a truth from something still less obvious than itself, but yet capable of demonstration, the argument for instance that what is greater than the whole is therefore greater than the part. On the strength therefore of God's fatherly goodness, Jesus specifies a number of gifts and blessings that He confers on men. The terms he uses for them do not give us a set of strictly co-ordinate and distinct favours; but they serve none the less as a rough working classification.

5. In the first place, then, *God provides for the bodily needs* of His children. "He raises His sun upon evil and good (men alike), and rains upon (the) righteous and unrighteous."[3] "Therefore, I

[1] Gen xviii. 14; Exod iv. 21, etc; Job xlii. 2; Mal i. 2–3; Rom ix. 10–26.

[2] Mc x. 27 b ||s, xiv. 36.

[3] Mt v. 45; cf Mc ii. 27: "The Sabbath came into being for man's sake."

say to you, do not be anxious for your life, (as to) what ye will (have to) eat or what to drink, nor for your body, what ye will (have to) wear. Is not the life more (important) than the food, and the body than the clothing? [1] Look at the birds of the heaven, how they sow not nor reap nor gather into barns, and (yet) your heavenly Father feeds them. Do ye not far surpass them? . . . And why are ye anxious about clothing? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow. They toil not, neither do they spin: but I tell you that not even Solomon in all his glory was clad like one of these. But if God so clothes the grass of the field, which is (growing) to-day and to-morrow is thrown into (the) oven, will He not much more (clothe) you, (ye men) of small faith? Do not therefore be anxious saying, 'What shall we eat?' or 'What shall we drink?' or 'What shall we wear?'—for all these things the Gentiles seek for—for your heavenly Father knows that ye need all these things. But seek first His Kingdom and His righteousness, and all these things will be given you in addition." [2] There is nothing here to justify the common idea that Jesus discouraged industry and forethought in the business affairs of life. The Authorized Version, with its archaic rendering, 'Take no thought,' obscures the main point of the passage from the eyes of a modern

[1] Here is an implicit argument a fortiori: "*i.e.* God who has already given the one, can surely give the other" (J. H. Oldham, *Studies on the Teaching of Jesus*, p. 60).

[2] Mt vi. 25–33=Lc xii. 22–31. Cf the saying ascribed to Jesus by Clemens of Alexandria and Origenes: "Ask for the great things and the little things will be added unto you; and ask for the heavenly things, and the earthly things will be added unto you" (Ropes, in Hastings' *DB* v, p. 349 b).

reader. The appeal to the birds and lilies is easily misunderstood: the argument implied is not, 'These creatures do not work, so you need not,' but: 'If God supplies their need, though they cannot toil like you, how much more (again the argument a fortiori) will He supply the needs of you men, whom He has equipped with energy and intelligence and so enabled to avail yourselves the more fully of His gifts in Nature? When therefore we pray: "Give us to-day our bread for the morrow,"[1] we do not ask to be relieved of the necessity of work; we ask that we may be helped to work so intelligently and efficiently, and with minds so untrammelled by worry, that our labours may secure to us the things we need. That qualification which Jesus introduces—"Seek ye first His Kingdom"—and all the hard facts of human mismanagement, poverty, starvation, luxury, and profiteering, do not avail to cancel the truth of God's giving. "God is the strong unresting Servant of His Universe. He reigns by serving . . . God has ever been the Super-drudge of His creation. . . . His activity is everywhere."[2]

6. But *God supplies the needs of the moral and spiritual life*, as well as of the physical. He feeds men with every word that issues from His mouth[3]: He fills those that hunger and thirst for righteousness[4]: the plants that He plants will never, like the Pharisees, be uprooted[5]: He has sent men Moses

[1] Mt vi. 11 ||.

[2] J. A. Robertson, *The Spiritual Pilgrimage of Jesus*, p. 179. The question of the many apparent exceptions to God's universal bounty is linked up with the general question of God's attitude to human suffering. This question is briefly discussed below, pp. 38–40.

[3] Mt iv. 4 ||. [4] Mt v. 6. [5] Mt xv. 13.

and the Prophets, to move them to repentance[1]: He wanted His house to be called a house of prayer for all the nations[2]: He grants a vision of Himself to the pure in heart[3]: He reveals things that flesh and blood cannot reveal, and He reveals them, not to the wise and clever, but to the simple and childlike, such as Simon Bar-jona[4]: He is to be asked not to lead us into temptation, but to rescue us from the evil one.[5]

It is not difficult for a modern Christian to believe in a general way that God assists him in his moral and spiritual life; but if the question be asked, 'Are the plants to blame if the Heavenly Father did not plant them?' or, 'Will God lead us into temptation, unless we ask Him not to?' the answer is not easy to give. The difficulty lies partly in the natural Calvinism of the Jewish, or rather the Semitic, mind. No skill on the part of modern commentators can eliminate the element of determinism from some of these words of Jesus. But such determinism came naturally to the Jew. It seemed to him to follow from the supreme sovereignty of God. God was in His world what Joseph was in the Egyptian's house: "Whatsoever they did there, He was the doer of it." Hence the idea of God hardening Pharaoh's heart, loving Jacob and hating Esau, and so on. How this belief in the universal agency of God was to be reconciled with a belief in man's responsibility for his sins or with the freedom of man's will, was a question that did not trouble the Jew. He simply believed that both sides of the discrepancy were true. Thus it is that

[1] Mt xxiii. 34 ||; Lc xvi. 29–31. [2] Mc xi. 17 ||s.
[3] Mt v. 8. [4] Mt xi. 25 f ||, xvi. 17. [5] Mt vi. 13 ||.

Jesus phrases the prayer for Divine help in such a way as to suggest to us that, if the help is not given, God and not ourselves will be responsible for the consequences.

We must not, however, be tempted to discard this teaching on the score of what we to-day may feel to be its obviously difficult presentation. It is easier for us to see the philosophical difficulty than to solve it. Not only the Jew—but every man—tends to be an unconscious Calvinist when he prays. Here for instance we are told of Brother Lawrence: "That when he had failed in his duty, he simply confessed his fault, saying to GOD, *I shall never do otherwise, if Thou leavest me to myself; 'tis Thou must hinder my falling, and mend what is amiss.* That after this, he gave himself no farther uneasiness about it." [1] It is all very well to say that human goodness is the work neither of man alone, nor of God alone, but of the two in co-operation. That may be true, but it does not solve the difficulty. For the question remains, who is to take the first step in the process? If God has to take it, then man's real freedom and responsibility are undermined: if man has to take it, then God's almightiness is denied. This last might not seem a very serious objection. Some modern Christian thinkers are quite ready to sacrifice the Divine omnipotence. Thus Canon Streeter writes: "The facts of this world form a Procrustean bed from which there is no escape. . . . We say that there is in God a principle of self-limitation whereby, though He has unlimited coercive power, yet He is prevented from using it; or else that omnipotence is a vague

[1] *The Practice of the Presence of God*, p. 13.

term; or else that the whole thing is beyond the range of our feeble minds. Anything, in fact, rather than give up the notion finally, completely, and absolutely. And yet this is what must be done. The conception of a Being who possesses infinite coercive power in addition to infinite moral goodness will not through any human ingenuity fit the uncompromising bed. But there is another conception which will fit into it exactly. It is that of a Being whose omnipotence consists in His moral goodness and in nothing else. If God's power is itself nothing else than love, then all becomes clear and intelligible." [1] Similarly, Dr. John Oman has done great service in urging that grace is not omnipotence working irresistibly in a straight line, and intelligible through mechanical categories, but "a gracious personal relationship," compelled to pursue its educative course by many devious paths.[2] All this is suggestive and helpful; but the substitution of love for coercion and of personal for mechanical categories does not solve the question, 'Who initiates the process?' If we are compelled to answer, 'Man,' then what becomes—we will not say of our belief in God's almightiness—but of our assurance of His ultimate triumph?

But fortunately for us, experience is in large measure independent of philosophical completeness and consistency: and we can therefore in the meantime rest content with the knowledge that God's help is necessary for us, and available for us if we truly desire it. When Horace Bushnell was travelling in Western America, he was struck by the

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, April 1914, pp. 609 f.
[2] *Grace and Personality*, Part I (pp. 1–75).

Artesian wells, which were to him "a charming symbol of the beauty of God, who is ever a grand water-store under this desert of life and sin, ready to well up in freshness when the conduits of the heart are opened to its flow." [1] The Father who is in secret is always waiting His opportunity, and taking it. "That same heart of the father, which in its hunger of love is so exacting, will, out of the same hunger, never despair, and never forsake: it will never cease from the pursuit of that responsive trust which it desires; it will make allowances, it will permit delays, it will weave excuses, it will endure rebuffs, it will condescend to persuasion, it will forget all provocations, it will wait, it will plead, it will repeat its pleas, it will take no refusal, it will overleap all obstacles, it will run risks, it will endlessly and untiringly forgive, if only, at the last, the stubborn child-heart yield, and the tender response of faith be won." [2]

7. One feature of this aggressive generosity of God is *His responsiveness to prayer.* Probably Jesus' hearers never questioned in the abstract the fact that God hears and answers prayer; but evidently they placed less practical reliance on it than they might have done. It is on this point that Jesus' use of the analogy of human—particularly parental—goodness is most forcible. Those parables of the man wanting to borrow three loaves from his friend at midnight, and of the unjust judge being pestered by the widow, put the issue clearly.[3] Can we believe that, if persistent petition is effective with a neigh-

[1] *Life and Letters,* p. 376.
[2] H. Scott Holland, in *Lux Mundi,* p. 14.
[3] Lc xi. 5–8, xviii. 1–8.

bour who does not want to be bothered, and with a judge who neither fears God nor has respect for man, it will not be all the more effective with God who loves us as His own children? "Ask," says Jesus therefore, "and it will be given you; seek, and ye will find; knock, and (the door) will be opened to you. For everyone that asks receives, and he that seeks finds, and to him that knocks (the door) is opened. Or what man is there of you, who, if his son asks him for a loaf, will give him a stone? or (who), if he asks for a fish, will give him a snake? or (who), if he asks for an egg, will give him a scorpion? If ye then, evil though you are, know (how) to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father in heaven give good things to those that ask Him?"[1] "Have faith in God! Truly I tell you, if ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye will (be able to) say to this mountain, 'Be lifted up and thrown into the sea,' and it will happen (so). Wherefore I say to you, all things whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye have received them, and ye will have them."[2]

In order to get the true meaning out of this oriental hyperbole, we shall have to bear in mind continually the conditions Jesus lays down for successful prayer, viz: persistence and faith. The former of these—disguised by the picturesque reference to the mountain moving at a word of command—means that we can lay down no definite time-limit within which we can be sure that our prayers will be granted. The second means that the thing must be asked for from the purest motive, and because it is believed

[1] Mt vii. 7–11 ||.

[2] Mc xi. 22–24; Mt xvii. 20, xxi. 21 f; Lc xvii. 6.

to be God's will, not because, like the wrecks which the Heligolanders used to pray for in their churches, it conforms to any selfish or base desire of our own. If these two conditions are satisfied there is nothing incredible in Jesus' promises. The substance of them is not so alien to the thought of to-day as we might be tempted to think. We find it re-echoed, for instance, in a somewhat unexpected quarter—the pages of a popular modern novelist. "If you've only got the grit to go on praying, praying hard, even against your own convictions, you'll get it sooner or later. You are bound to get it. . . . If you want it hard enough, and keep on clamouring for it, it becomes the very thing of all others you need—the great essential. And you'll get it for that very reason." [1] And the great affirmation of the so-called 'New Thought' school, that whatever a man wants he will get if he wants it hard enough and long enough, what is it but the declaration of Jesus that God gives us whatever we ask for persistently and in faith?

8. *God "will endlessly and untiringly forgive"*: but His forgiveness is not the mere remission of a penalty—it may or may not include that: it is the formation or restoration of family fellowship, as we see it for instance in the reconciliation between the prodigal son and his father. We must leave over to a later stage our consideration of Jesus' teaching about the atonement, as this involves his view of his own death. But it will be useful at this point to note certain facts about his view of forgiveness. We find, for instance, no trace in Jesus' thought of the theological distinction between

[1] Ethel M. Dell, *The Way of an Eagle* ch. xxiv.

God's 'righteousness' (or justice [1]) and His love. "His justice *is* his forgiveness; his forgiveness *is* his justice. His righteousness *is* his love: his love *is* his righteousness. There is no conceivability of conflict between them." [2] And whatever be the true relation of Jesus' death to the Divine forgiveness, there is no sanction for the idea implicit in so many doctrines of the atonement, that God never really forgave sin until Jesus died [3]—the idea that caused Dante to represent John the Baptist as spending two years in hell, the two that elapsed between his own death and that of Jesus, before he could be taken up to heaven.[4] That God could and did forgive sin altogether independently of Jesus' death is proved by Jesus' own references to Divine forgiveness as an already existing thing before that death was accomplished. The parables of the man going in quest of his straying sheep and rejoicing when he finds it, of the woman ransacking the house for a lost coin, and of the father making merry on the prodigal's return, depict God as normally eager to forgive from sheer natural affection.[5] The parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus represents attention to Moses and the prophets as a sufficient safeguard against punishment in the next life.[6] Convincing evidence of the experience of Divine forgiveness,

[1] The Latin word 'justitia,' whence our 'justice,' is the equivalent of the Greek δικαιοσύνη, which is the word translated 'righteousness' in the New Testament.

[2] C. G. Montefiore, in *Hibbert Journal*, July 1916, p. 780.

[3] Cf *Lux Mundi*, pp. 154, 223.

[4] *Paradiso*, xxxii, stanzas 8 f, with Cary's note.

[5] Lc xv. 1–32; Mt xviii. 12–14. Cf also the daily petition for pardon enjoined in the 'Lord's prayer.' Did Jesus not mean this prayer to be offered until after the Crucifixion?

[6] Lc xvi. 27–31.

before and independently of the work of Jesus, is found in the words of the Psalmist : " As far as the east is from the west, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us. Like as a father pitieth His children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him. For He knoweth our frame ; He remembereth that we are dust." [1]

The one great condition of Divine pardon, so far as man is concerned, is genuine 'repentance'—or change of heart and mind. If forgiveness is rightly described as reconciliation, the necessity of such a repentance is obvious. Hence the need of the daily prayer—" Forgive us our debts." [2] It is true that Jesus seems to have in mind a second condition, on which he insists frequently and with great emphasis—viz : the forgiveness by the sinner of those who have wronged him. Without this, says Jesus, God will not forgive him.[3] But this condition is probably no more than an important corollary of true repentance—a corollary the absence of which would show that the professed repentance was not genuine. While it is true that full forgiveness, in the sense of reconciliation, depends on man's repentance, it is also true that there is a sense in which God forgives sin before it is repented of. So Jesus prays Him to forgive his murderers even while they were in the act of murdering him.[4]

The statement of Jesus that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit would never be forgiven [5] remains

[1] Ps ciii. 12–14. [2] Mt vi. 12 ||.
[3] Mt vi. 12 ||, 14 f, xviii. 21–35 ; Mc xi. 25 (26).
[4] Lc xxiii. 34.
[5] Mc iii. 28 f ; Mt xii. 31 f ; Lc xii. 10.

an unsolved enigma. We can hardly question the truth of the record of this statement: but what the statement means, and whether it is true, we cannot tell. The whole conception of God which we derive from Jesus seems to negative the idea. "There is no sin, and there can be no sin on all the earth, which the Lord will not forgive to the truly repentant! Man cannot commit a sin so great as to exhaust the infinite love of God. Can there be a sin which could exceed the love of God?" [1] "There is no sin, no state that, being regretted and repented of, can stand between God and man." [2] So we learn from Jesus to speak and think of God. Unless Jesus is speaking of something altogether out of the range of human moral experience—and that is hardly likely—it is very difficult to follow him. It is no explanation to point to the extreme seriousness and heinousness of the sin referred to; for we know that God pardons serious and heinous sin. Can it be that, in the heat of controversy and in a moment of righteous indignation, Jesus framed his words in accordance with the sterner side of that Jewish conception of God in which he had been educated, rather than according to his own personal experience and knowledge of God?

9. Jesus sometimes speaks of *'the Kingdom of God' as a gift.* "Fear not, little flock," he says to the disciples, "for your Father is pleased to give you the Kingdom." [3] "The Kingdom of God will be taken away from you," he says to the Chief Priests and Pharisees, "and will be given to a nation pro-

[1] Dostoievsky, *The Brothers Karamazov* (ET), p. 48.
[2] H. G. Wells, *God the Invisible King*, p. 184.
[3] Lc xii. 32.

ducing its (the Kingdom's) fruits." [1] The news of its nearness he describes as good news.[2] We are to pray God that it may come.[3] It is like a buried treasure, which a man rejoices to find. It is like a precious pearl, to procure which a merchant sells all that he possesses.[4] It belongs to the childlike,[5] the poor in spirit,[6] and those who have been persecuted for righteousness' sake.[7] Jesus' conception of the Kingdom is many-sided; but the one element essential to every aspect of it is this: the filial submission of man to God as his King and Father. Not only therefore is it the social ideal suggested (however imperfectly) by Jewish eschatology, the 'good time coming' in the near future,[8] but also—and we may add, as a pre-requisite and means to that future and social ideal—it is a present and personal ideal. The word translated 'Kingdom' means 'sovereignty,' 'kingship,' as well as 'realm': even the Rabbis seem to have recognized this meaning,[9] as Jesus certainly did when he said: "The Kingdom of God is within you." [10] Not only is it a gift of

[1] Mt xxi. 43, 45: the words were a sequel to the parable of the vineyard which had been let out (lit 'given out') to vine-dressers and, when these proved disloyal, was taken away and 'given' to others (Mt xxi. 33, 41 ||s).

[2] Mc i. 15 ||. [3] Mt vi. 10 ||. [4] Mt xiii. 44–46.

[5] Mc x. 14 f; Mt xviii. 3, xix. 14; Lc xviii. 16 f.

[6] Mt v. 3 (cf Lc vi. 20). [7] Mt v. 10.

[8] As, e.g., in Mt viii. 11 f (cf Lc xiii. 28 f).

[9] "The Rabbis used the term "Kingdom of Heaven" sometimes with an inward reference, to denote the abstract supremacy of the Law of God in the heart. Whoever undertook to keep the Law of God was in that sense said to accept the yoke of "the Kingdom of Heaven"" (Manson, *Christ's View of the Kingdom of God*, p. 69; cf Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* (ET), pp. 92, 94, 96 ff.

[10] Lc xvii. 21. The following are the other passages depicting the Kingdom more or less clearly as *present*: Mt v. 3, 10, vi. 33,

true bliss [1]; it is also—as we shall see—the most strenuous of tasks.[2]

10. Life in the Kingdom involves persecution and distress, but the Kingdom is none the less a rich gift for that, for *God promises help, protection, and guidance in the midst of trouble.* "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And (yet) not one of them will fall to the ground without your Father (? knowing it). But as for you, even the hairs of (your) head are all numbered. Fear not therefore; ye far surpass sparrows (in value)." [3] "Not a hair of your head shall perish." [4]

And yet the sparrows do fall, and the martyrs die, and the innocent suffer at the hands of the guilty. What does Jesus mean by saying that not a hair of our heads will perish? His words seem

vii. 13 f, xi. 11 f (=Lc xvi. 16), xii. 28 (Lc xi. 20), xiii. 24 ff, 31–33, 38, xviii. 3 f, xxi. 31, xxiii. 13 (cf Lc xi. 52); Mc x. 15 ||s (Gk), xii. 34; Lc x. 17–20. Cf Stevens, *The Theology of the New Testament*, pp. 37 f; W. Sanday, in Hastings' *DB* ii. p. 620; B. H. Streeter in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 432 f; J. Moffatt, *Theology of the Gospels*, pp. 49–57.

[1] Mt v. 3–12, etc. [2] Mt vii. 13 f, xi. 12 ||; Lc ix. 62.

[3] Mt x. 29–31; Lc xii. 6 f. Cf Mc iv. 40 || (lack of faith in God during a storm).

[4] Lc xxi. 18. We must remember that the ordinary un-Grecized Jew of Palestine had no idea of a future life of the soul only, apart from the body. That is the fact underlying the language of Mt v 29 f, xviii. 8 f ||. It may also explain the mention of the hair in this passage, i.e. (Lc xxi. 18, cf xii. 7 ||) the purport of which clearly is that the resurrection-life in all its fulness will be secured to the martyr. The passage in Mc xiii. 19 f ||, about God shortening the days of affliction for the sake of His elect, occurs in a context that lies under some suspicion of coming from a small early Christian apocalypse, rather than from the lips of Jesus himself: see Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, pp. 207–209. Similarly the promise of vengeance in Lc xviii. 7 f, as Montefiore (*Synoptic Gospels*, p. 1020) says, "seems to reflect a time of persecution, and to be therefore later than Jesus."

to flout us. We are told that one great obstacle to a real belief in God in the army was the obvious fact that God was not really shielding men from the constant danger of death.[1] People to-day are impatient of being told that God will protect them and their dear ones: such a statement is so patently out of keeping with the facts of life.[2] All the same, the confident assurances of Jesus, even though they pay no heed to the inexorability of natural law, yet enshrine a truth independent of all physical disaster, not excluding even the war. Physical danger is inevitable in a rational world such as men need to live in and to exploit: and God could not abolish it without stultifying His own laws and destroying that regularity of nature so indispensable to human life and intelligence. But when we realize that physical safety, though a great boon, is not one of the ultimate values, we can see that it is possible for God to help us to preserve those values, even though life and limb be endangered. "We tend unconsciously to assume that God will not let tragedy touch us. It is an assumption for which the facts of life provide no warrant. But while this is the case, all that we can reasonably demand is fulfilled, if we can prove that God comes to us in every happening, and through every circumstance, and

[1] *The Army and Religion*, pp. 23–30, 162 f, 166.

[2] See the incisive denial of H. G. Wells, in *God the Invisible King*, pp. 46 f ("... He will not even mind your innocent children for you if you leave them before an unguarded fire. Cherish no delusions; ..."), and compare Tennyson's bitter lines in *In Memoriam* (vi.):

> "O mother, praying God will save
> Thy sailor,—while thy head is bow'd,
> His heavy-shotted hammock-shroud
> Drops in his vast and wandering grave."

that to find Him in them is to transmute them into a good. This is assuredly the case. Like every wise father, God is concerned not so much with what happens to us, but with what we are as we meet life's circumstances." [1] Many a father has learnt, while longing for his son's safety in danger, to prefer that the danger should prove fatal rather than that the son should act dishonourably. In somewhat the same way God is more concerned over our fellowship with Him and the way we behave than over our physical safety. That is why Jesus tells the disciples, not that God will prevent them suffering persecution, but that He will help them to do the right thing under persecution. " Whenever they carry you off and hand (you) over, do not be anxious beforehand (about) what ye will say ; but whatever is given to you at that hour, say that. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you." [2]

11. This leads us on to the conception of *God as the Giver of Rewards*. In recognition not only of the brave endurance of suffering for the Kingdom's sake, but also of faithful everyday service, God rewards men. The word translated ' reward,' which Jesus uses of God's response to genuine almsgiving, prayer, and fasting, means simply ' pay ' or 'wages.' [3] What reward, he asks, do people get who love only those that love them ? [4] Those who are hospit-

[1] W. F. Halliday, *Reconciliation and Reality*, p. 107. Cf Wells, l.c. : " He will be with you as you face death ; . . . He will come so close to you that . . . the present death will be swallowed up in his victory."

[2] Mc xiii. 11 ; Mt x. 19 f : cf Lc xii. 11 f, xxi. 14 f.

[3] Mt vi. 1, 2 (cf 4), 5 (cf 6), 16 (cf 18).

[4] Mt v. 46 : cf Lc vi. 32–34.

able to a prophet or a righteous man will get a prophet's or a righteous man's reward. He who gives a cup of water to a disciple will by no means lose his reward.[1] One of the parables of the Kingdom describes the dealings of a householder with hired day-labourers: all who serve receive the just payment promised to them, although, owing to lack of opportunity, some have done less work than others.[2] In another passage Jesus specifies the rewards as being "in heaven." When persecuted, "rejoice and exult, for great (is) your reward in heaven." [3] "Store up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust corrodes, and where thieves do not dig through or steal; for where thy treasure is, there also will be thy heart." [4] "Rejoice not over this—that the spirits are submissive to you, but rejoice because your names have been written in heaven." [5] The use of the word 'heaven' in this connection shows that Jesus is thinking of God and His Kingdom. The reward is in fact the Kingdom, looked at in the light of the happiness bestowed upon those who enter it. In the Synoptic Gospels as we have them, this reward figures most explicitly in connection with the future, viz: 'the age to come,' and the life after death. Thus Jesus says that whoever has suffered loss for his sake or for the sake of the good news, will receive a hundredfold even in this season, and in the age that is coming eternal life.[6] Thus too he refutes the Sadducees' disbelief in the life after death by an appeal to the

[1] Mt x. 41 f; Mc ix. 41. [2] Mt xx. 1–15. [3] Mt v. 12.
[4] Mt vi. 20 f: cf Lc xii. 33 f. [5] Lc x. 20.
[6] Mc x. 29–31 ||s. A comparison of Lc x. 25, 28 with Mc xii. 34 shows the identity of the Kingdom of God with 'eternal life.'

Scriptures and the power of God. If God is ever the God *of* anyone, i.e. if there is any real fellowship between God and men, that relation must be independent of physical death: "when (people) rise from the dead, they . . . are like angels in heaven." [1] Our belief in the future life may find valuable confirmation in the results of psychical research, and spiritually-minded people are ill-advised to ignore or despise these investigations; but there can be no doubt that the real foundation of the belief is where Jesus found it—in the experience and knowledge which man has of God.

> I cannot doubt that they whom you deplore
> Are glorified; or, if they sleep, shall wake
> From sleep, and dwell with God in endless love.
> Hope, below this, consists not with belief
> In mercy, carried infinite degrees
> Beyond the tenderness of human hearts.[2]

But the glories of the coming age and the life beyond the grave are only special aspects of that larger conception of reward which makes it, like the Kingdom itself, a present reality, as well as a blessing stored up for the future. Much of Jesus' language in the Synoptics lends itself readily to this interpretation.[3] It is the peculiar merit of the author of the Fourth Gospel that he has extracted from the Master's words and brought into prominence the tremendous truth that eternal life—the life

[1] Mc xii. 24–27; Mt xxii. 29–32. Lc (xx. 34–38) has several interesting variants.

[2] Wordsworth, *The Excursion*, iv. (p. 335 of 1860 edn of his *Works*).

[3] See the passages quoted on pp. 37 f n 10, indicating a *present* Kingdom. We might add other promises couched in the indefinite future, like the Beatitudes promising comfort to the mourners and mercy to the merciful (Mt v. 4, 7; Lc vi. 21).

that is life indeed—is a present and eternally abiding possession.[1]

We shall have to consider later the bearing of this doctrine of rewards on Jesus' conception of human duty. Here we have simply to note the candour and simplicity with which it is set forth in his teaching.

[1] John v. 24, vi. 47, x. 28.

II

THE PERSON AND WORK OF JESUS

1. The *consciousness of Jesus,* as revealed to us in the records of his life and words, is that of a man who feels himself to be God's beloved Son, in whom his Father is well pleased,[1] who is fully known by no one except the Father, and who alone fully knows the Father so as to be able to reveal Him to others.[2] He claims to hold a large and special commission from God to his fellow-men.[3] "All things have been handed over to me by my Father."[4] "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because He has anointed me."[5] Accordingly he describes himself as greater than Solomon, greater than Jonah,[6] greater than the Temple,[7] as master of the Sabbath,[8] as the chief corner-stone which has come from the

[1] Mc i. 11 ||s; Mt xvii. 5 ||s. [2] Mt xi. 27 ||.

[3] In the Parable of the Vineyard (Mc xii. 1–12 ||s), Jesus contrasts himself and the Prophets under the figures of the 'beloved son' and the servants.

[4] Mt xi. 27 ||. O. Holtzmann argues very plausibly that the 'all things' handed over to Jesus by his Father does not mean 'the world,' but refers to 'these things' of Mt xi. 25, namely, the truths about God and himself that Jesus was teaching (*Life of Jesus*, ET, pp. 283–287).

[5] Lc iv. 18. [6] Mt xii. 41 f ||. [7] Mt xii. 6.

[8] Mc ii. 28 ||s, though the context makes it possible that 'Son of Man' here has merely the sense of 'man.' (K. Lake, *Stewardship of Faith*, pp. 47 f).

Lord and is marvellous in men's eyes.[1] He teaches with authority.[2] He claims the right to forgive sins.[3] He accepts the plaudits of the crowd as being no more than his due.[4] He cures illnesses by a touch or a word.[5] He claims to have overpowered Satan in his own headquarters, and so to be able to expel Satan's emissaries, the evil spirits, by a simple word of command, uttered in the Spirit of God.[6] This special commission of his he identifies—though reticently—with the Messiahship foreshadowed by the Prophets and expected by his fellow-countrymen.[7] He avows to Kaiaphas that he is the Messiah,[8] and to Pilate that he is the King of the Jews.[9]

2. These extraordinary claims, and the way in which Jesus vindicated them during his earthly life and later in Christian experience, led the early Church

[1] Mc xii. 10 f ||s. In the Hebrew of Ps cxviii. 22 f, from which Jesus would naturally quote, it is not quite clear whether it is the stone or its elevation that is marvellous.

[2] Mc i. 22; Mt vii. 28 f; Lc iv. 32.

[3] Mc ii. 5–11 ||s; Lc vii. 36–50: see below, p. 58.

[4] Mt xxi. 1–17 ||s (esp. Lc xix. 39 f).

[5] The so-called 'nature-miracles' (Mc iv. 39–41, vi. 35 ff, viii. 1 ff, xi. 14, 20 f ||s) should probably be regarded as legendary perversions or exaggerations, springing from a desire to heighten Jesus' miraculous power. See below, p. 53 n 8.

[6] Mt xii. 25–29 ||s.

[7] See Mt xvi. 13–20 ||s for the private confession of his Messiahship by the disciples.

[8] Mc xiv. 61 f ||s.

[9] Mc xv. 2 ||s. In Mt xxvi. 53 Jesus is stated to have said that his Father would send him more than twelve legions of angels if he asked for them. In Mc xii. 35–37 ||s, Jesus argues that Messiahship is at least independent of, if not incompatible with, Davidic descent. The natural, though perhaps not inevitable, inference is that he did not regard himself as descended from David: see O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus* (ET), pp. 82–84.

to ascribe *Divinity* to him in so absolute a sense that the only escape from the reproach of worshipping two Gods lay in the development of the doctrine of the Trinity and the consequent doctrine of the two natures—divine and human—united in the one person of Christ. These doctrines are embodied in the historic creeds of the Church. Apart altogether from the question as to whether the acceptance of a credal statement is a satisfactory test of a man's right to membership in the Christian Church, there is the question as to what place can be given to these particular creeds in the general body of Christian teaching to-day. The fact that the men who drew them up had no more ability to frame infallible doctrinal statements than any other set of sincere and intelligent followers of Jesus of those times or of these, robs the creeds of any claim to be accepted simply 'on authority'—by virtue of a sort of 'argumentum ad verecundiam.' They have got to be examined on their merits as philosophical statements, put forward to explain Christian history and experience. On examining them from this point of view, while we may venerate and largely share the convictions of their authors, we cannot but reject them as unenlightening. The dual nature which they assert of Jesus is unintelligible from the point of view of modern psychology. They profess to rest on history,[1] but they do scant justice to the facts of Jesus' humanity. They draw their information as to his consciousness—e.g. of pre-existence—in the main from the admittedly doubtful sayings

[1] "Councils, we admit, and Creeds, cannot go behind, but must wholly rest upon the history of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Moberly in *Lux Mundi*, p. 177).

in the Fourth Gospel.[1] They cannot be really harmonized with the human limitations of Jesus. It is, in fact, now generally recognized that, however the creeds are to be interpreted, Jesus was not omniscient.[2] He had no knowledge of the facts revealed by modern critical study in regard to the authorship of the Old Testament Scriptures. He stated plainly that he did not know the day or hour of his own future coming.[3] He asked questions in a way that showed that he desired information of which he was not already in possession.[4] He admitted that he had no authority to give away the places on his right and left hand in his Kingdom.[5] It is often said that, though Jesus called God the Father of men and also his own Father, he refrained from saying 'Our Father,' thus implying a distinction between his sonship and theirs.[6] But what force is left to this distinction in view of the fact that he referred to his followers as his brothers ?[7] Apologists for the creeds confidently assert that Jesus was sinless in the most absolute sense, despite the fact

[1] Often obviously misinterpreting even them. It is clear, for instance, from the context of Jn x. 30 (cf 36), xvii. 11, that the oneness with the Father, of which the Johannine Jesus speaks, is something quite different from the metaphysical oneness asserted in the creeds.

[2] See Temple, in *Foundations*, p. 213. [3] Mc xiii. 32 ||.

[4] The clearest case is that of Mc v. 30–34 ||s, for kindness and delicacy would surely have prevented Jesus pressing his question in public, had he known the circumstances.

[5] Mc x. 40 ; Mt xx. 23.

[6] So, e.g. Rush Rhees, *Life of Jesus*, p. 262 ; W. E. Orchard, *The Necessity of Christ*, p. 87.

[7] Mc iii. 33–35 ||s ; Mt xxv. 40, xxviii. 10 ; Jn xx. 17. Even if the last two are not *ipsissima verba*, they yet represent the impression Jesus left. Cf on this point Lake, *Stewardship of Faith*, pp. 146 f.

that we know too little of his life or of the psychology of sin [1] to be able to insist dogmatically on sweeping conclusions in regard to such a point, and to build doctrines upon them: nor do they adequately explain why Jesus submitted to a baptism of repentance,[2] or why he objected to being addressed as 'Good master,' on the ground that "(there is) none good save one, (namely) God," [3] or why the author of Hebrews described him as "learning obedience by the things that he suffered." [4] We should never suspect from the prayers which Jesus uttered that he knew himself to be the Second Person of the Trinity. It is simply not true to history to say that the New Testament witnesses "testify unhesitatingly . . . that His life and death were penetrated by the consciousness of His own Godhead; and by the deliberate purpose . . . of convincing the whole world in the end of His Godhead." [5] Modern attempts to restate the doctrine

[1] See below, pp. 79–82.

[2] The colloquy of Mt iii. 14 f—one of those explanations that explain nothing—was clearly an early Christian attempt to meet the difficulty. We are on safer historical ground with the fragment of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, in which Jesus replies to the suggestion of his family that they should all go and be baptized by John: "What sin have I committed that I should go and be baptized by him?—unless perchance this very thing that I have said is ignorance" (Hastings' *DB* v. p. 341 b; Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, p. 4).

[3] Mc x. 18; Lc xviii. 19. Cf the deliberate alteration of this in Mt xix. 17. There have been of course many attempts to get out of the difficulty (e.g. Pressensé, *Jesus Christ*, book IV, ch. iv; Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* (ET), pp. 337 f; Rhees, *op cit*, p. 266) but I have never yet seen one that did justice to the record without imperilling the *traditional view* of Jesus' sinlessness.

[4] Heb v. 8.

[5] Moberly in *Lux Mundi*, p. 173. Cf the exaggerated statement on the same page that Jesus' own companions "taught and believed, without shadow of hesitation, that He was very God."

generally treat the historical facts with more respect; but for that very reason they fall short of establishing the position laid down with such intolerant certainty in the creeds. The creeds in fact are to-day more unintelligible than the facts they try to explain —they run so counter to the intelligible as to be almost meaningless.[1] Well might Augustine dream of the Child Jesus trying to empty the ocean into a hole in the sands in order to rebuke the saint's attempts to fathom the mystery of the Trinity![2] Well might Melancthon say that we should know how the two natures were united in Christ, when we reach the future life![3] Well may Rauschenbusch ask what Jesus would have said to the symbol of Chalcedon or to the Athanasian Creed, if they had been read to him![4]

3. But the repudiation of the creeds is not to be taken as a denial of *the greatness and wonder of the facts* they were meant to explain. It simply means a rejection of those particular explanations of them as not useful. 'The abysmal deeps of personality'—in God, in Jesus, and in ourselves—still yawn before us, unfathomed and uncharted. The thoughtful Christian of to-day is less ambitious than the fathers of Nicæa and Chalcedon. He does not attempt with the aid of crude and almost mechanical categories of substance, person, and the like, to dogmatize as they did about the most wondrous of all mysteries. He is content to operate with the more familiar conceptions of moral personality and

[1] Cf Temple, *op cit*, p. 230: "The formula of Chalcedon is, in fact, a confession of the bankruptcy of Greek Patristic Theology."

[2] Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, ii. p. 606.

[3] Milner, *History of the Church*, vi. p. 407.

[4] *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, p. 25.

moral value. Not that he is the first to think along these lines. The Adoptionists of the early Church virtually occupied this standpoint. It is also—in part at least—that of Milton:

> Thou . . . hast been found
> By merit more than birthright Son of God,
> Found worthiest to be so by being good,
> Far more than great or high; because in thee
> Love hath abounded more than glory abounds.[1]

But we have had to wait almost until to-day to hear Christian thinkers of unquestionably orthodox connections speak frankly in the same strain. "Unlike ancient attempts to meet the Evangelic facts," say Drs. Bartlet and Carlyle, "by a theory of concealment or voluntary holding in abeyance of full Divinity actually present in Christ's self-consciousness,[2] most agree that the limitations to be accounted for were real and not merely apparent. Thereby the likeness of the Saviour to His 'brethren' whom He sanctifies and brings to the glory of their true destiny, 'the image of God,' is made more real and the moral power of His sinless example enhanced. 'The human in Him *is* divine. When He is most truly human (Son of Man), then He is most truly God.' This would have seemed to the fourth and fifth centuries sheer paradox.[3] But most

[1] *Paradise Lost*, iii. 308–312.

[2] This is a reference to the theory of kenosis, which, on the basis of Phil ii. 6 f, regards the human Jesus as possessed of all the attributes of Deity, but as temporarily abstaining from the exercise of them. An excellent account of ancient and modern interpretations of this passage is given by Loofs in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, vii. pp. 680–687 (C.J.C.).

[3] We might go further, and say it would have seemed sheer blasphemy (C.J.C.).

moderns could accept, as far as it goes, this conception of the homogeneity of personality in God and man. At the same time the idea of the Holy Spirit as real medium of the Divine both in 'the man Christ Jesus' and in Christians—in their case under forms determined by His historic manifestation as Son of Man and Son of God—is coming to its full rights." [1] "Those things which are looked upon as human," says Rev. W. F. Halliday, "His meek and lowly and pure heartedness, are infinitely more divine than mere knowledge or power." [2] "The divinity of Christ," says Dean Inge, "implies—one might almost say it means—the eternal supremacy of those moral qualities which He exhibited in their perfection." [3]

4. The way in which Jesus conceived of *his mission* was determined by his fellowship on the one hand with God and on the other with men. The former issued in moral purity and inward peace: the latter issued in compassion on the multitudes.[4] Yet the two motives were not disconnected; for moral purity meant love for his fellows, and compassion meant a desire that they should share his own Divine Sonship. And so he came, not to be served, but to serve.[5]

5. Many indeed were the forms in which he offered *his services to men.* He came to seek and to save that which was lost,[6] in particular the lost sheep of the house of Israel,[7] to bring salvation to the

[1] Bartlet and Carlyle, *Christianity in History*, pp. 602 f.
[2] *Reconciliation and Reality*, p. 63.
[3] *Outspoken Essays*, p. 135.
[4] Mc vi. 34 ||s, viii. 2 ||. For other references to Jesus' compassion, see Mc i. 41; Lc vii. 13; Mt xx. 34.
[5] Mc x. 45 ||. [6] Lc xix. 10. [7] Mt x. 5 f, xv. 24–26 ||.

sons of Abraham[1]—'salvation' being in essence the fulfilment of God's purpose for men's lives, just as its opposite (loss, or destruction, or perdition) means the defeat—not necessarily final—of that purpose.[2] He came to proclaim release to captives, and to set the oppressed at liberty[3]: he invited the toiling and burdened to come and find rest with him, for he was gentle and lowly of heart[4]: he often wanted to gather the children of Jerusalem together as a hen gathers her chickens together under her wings[5]: the season of his coming was the season of God's visitation, and what he was bringing were the things that made for their peace.[6] He bade men be of good courage, and fear not: it is thus he speaks to the sinful and helpless paralytic,[7] to the shrinking woman who had touched his garment,[8] to Jairus anxiously trembling on the brink of bereavement,[9] to Peter aghast at the near presence of Divine power and holiness,[10] and to the disciples when tossing on the stormy lake,[11] when overawed at the Transfiguration,[12] and when faced with the prospect of hardship and persecution.[13]

6. A large part of his early ministry consisted of *the performance of cures* of all kinds. Jesus certainly regarded insanity,"[14] and very probably illness in general,[15] as being the work of Satan and his

[1] Lc xix. 9. [2] Cf Mt xviii. 14. [3] Lc iv. 18.
[4] Mt xi. 28–30: cf Mc vi. 31. [5] Mt xxiii. 37 ||.
[6] Lc xix. 42, 44. [7] Mt ix. 2. [8] Mt ix. 22.
[9] Mc v. 36 ||. [10] Lc v. 10. [11] Mc vi. 50 ||.
[12] Mt xvii. 7. [13] Mt x. 26, 28, 31; Lc xii. 4, 7, 32.
[14] Mt xii. 24–29 ||s.

[15] Lc iv. 39, xiii. 11, 16. The faith of the centurion—based on his own military power—in Jesus' ability to cure paralysis by a word of command implies a sort of personification of the illness itself (Mt viii. 5–10 ||). See below, p. 100 n 1.

servants—work which it was part of his mission to undo. Having overpowered Satan himself, he was now at liberty to plunder his goods.[1] His miracles were acts of human pity,[2] and at the same time signs of his Divine commission.[3] While the Gospels often give us the impression that the cures were wrought by the almost casual utterance of a word of command or by a simple touch, yet we see clearly that this was by no means always the case. That they often involved the expenditure of time, effort, and energy, appears from Jesus' occasional use of clay and saliva,[4] from his cure of a certain blind man not all at once, but by stages,[5] from his use of prayer and perhaps also fasting in dealing with stubborn cases,[6] and from his sense that power had gone out of him, when a sufferer touched his clothes and was relieved.[7] Yet his willingness to cure seems to have been limited only by his desire to safeguard the still more essential forms of his ministry.[8]

[1] Mc iii. 27 ‖s.

[2] Mc i. 41; Lc vii. 13; Mt xx. 34: cf O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus* (ET), pp. 191 ff; Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels*, p. 66; and D. S. Cairns, *The Army and Religion*, p 386.

[3] Mt xi. 2–6, 20–24 ‖.

[4] Mc vii. 33, viii. 23; Jn ix. 6.

[5] Mc viii. 22–25.

[6] Mc vii. 34 ("looking up to heaven"), ix. 28 f: cf Jn xi. 33, 38, 41 f.

[7] Mc v. 30; Lc viii. 46.

[8] The 'nature-miracles' have already been referred to (p. 45 n 5). The two stories in Mc of the feeding of a crowd are probably doublets of the same original. The fact that the incident is narrated in all four gospels does not establish its literal historicity; for Mc's Gospel—the earliest of the four—was probably not written until 35 years after Jesus' death—an ample interval for legendary enlargements to establish themselves. The narratives probably arose from some actual exhibition of hospitality or generosity on Jesus' part, combined with a parabolic expression of his being the giver of spiritual food. (See Dr. G. W. Wade's useful remarks in *The Hibbert Journal* for January 1920, pp. 327 f, where he sug-

7. For Jesus did not confine his ministrations to alleviating the physical ills of men: he claimed to be regarded as their *guide and teacher in spiritual and moral matters*. Throughout the whole of his ministry he was always busy teaching somebody; now it was a crowd, now a little group of friends or opponents, now an individual: sometimes he spoke in parables, sometimes without: he taught in the synagogues, in the Temple, in his friends' houses, on the seashore, in the fields, on the road, on the mountain-top—always teaching. Proclaiming the good news of the Kingdom to the poor went hand-in-hand with the curing of illnesses and the expulsion of evil spirits.[1] He called the toiling and burdened to learn from him and to take upon themselves his kindly yoke and that light burden which was so different from the heavy load that the Scribes and Pharisees put upon men's shoulders.[2] He spoke to men as one who had an independent authority from God to do so.[3] He was the friend of tax-collectors and sinners.[4] He called those who

gests that the story of Elisha feeding 100 men with 20 loaves (2 Kings iv. 42–44) may have had something to do with the story of Jesus feeding the crowd.) Cf the saying ascribed to Jesus by Origenes (*Comm. in Mt* xiii. 2): "For the sake of the weak I became weak, and for the sake of the hungry I hungered, and for the sake of the thirsty I thirsted" (Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, p. 28).

[1] Mt iv. 23, xi. 5 ‖; Lc iv. 18. [2] Mt xi. 28–30, xxiii. 4 ‖.

[3] Mc i. 22, 27; Mt vii. 28 f; Lc iv. 32: and compare the tone of Mt v. 21 f, 27 f, 33 f, 38 f, 43 f. On Jesus as a thinker, cf R. Rhees, *Life of Jesus of Nazareth*, pp. 229 ("The freshness of his ideas is proof that he was not lacking in thorough and orderly thinking," etc), 235 ("He was as worthy to be Master of his disciples' thinking as he was to be Lord of their hearts"), 238; O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus* (ET), p. 463 ("The victorious clearness of his intellect"). [4] Mt xi. 19 ‖.

accepted his message his brothers and sisters,[1] and spoke of them collectively as a temple of God made without hands.[2] The thought that, under the physical conditions of his ministry, he could reach and influence in this personal way so small a number of people, lay like a weight on his heart. In order to reach a larger number he trained the Twelve and sent them out to do the same sort of work as himself: they were to come after him, and he would make them, like himself, fishers of men.[3] Yet even so, the need was greater than the means of coping with it. The harvest was plenteous, but the reapers were few: they must pray to the great Owner of the harvest to send out more reapers.[4] Such was his passion to reveal the Father to men[5] and to impart to them an understanding of His will and a desire to do it.

8. The ministry of teaching and healing bestowed by Jesus on men was reinforced by *his prayers on their behalf.* He looks up to heaven and prays before saying to the blind man, "Open."[6] He knew of evil spirits that could not be expelled without prayer.[7] Women brought their little children to him for him to put his hands on them and pray; and he put his arms round them and invoked on them God's blessing.[8] He prayed for Simon that his faith might not fail.[9] But not only does Jesus pray for his followers; he also assists at their

[1] Mc iii. 33–35 ||s.

[2] Mc xiv. 58; Mt xxvi. 61; Jn ii. 19 (the explanation in Jn ii. 21 f, applying the words to the resurrection, is incorrect: see J. M. Thompson in *The Expositor* for Sept. 1917, pp. 218–220).

[3] Mc i. 17 ||s.

[4] Mt ix. 37 f ||.

[5] Mt xi. 27.

[6] Mc vii. 34.

[7] See above, p. 53 n 6.

[8] Mc x. 13–16 ||s.

[9] Lc xxii. 32.

prayers. He says that where two or three are gathered together in his name, he is there in the midst of them, and that therefore whatever prayers they offer in accord with one another will be granted.[1] This idea of the unseen presence of Jesus everywhere with his disciples was brought later into prominence by Paul and the author of the Johannine writings; and some of the sayings about it ascribed to Jesus may be a reading-back of later Christian experience into the story of his life-time. So probably we should have to regard the post-resurrection saying: "Behold, I am with you all the days until the consummation of the age."[2] At the same time, the very prominence of this idea later on is best explained by the supposition that the historical Jesus had suggested it himself. This probability must be borne in mind in appraising the genuineness of sayings like that about the two or three gathered together, supported as it is by other utterances in which Jesus identifies himself with the little child received in his name,[3] with the travelling missionaries sent forth by him,[4] and with his hungry and needy brethren everywhere.[5] Among the Agrapha is a saying to this effect: "Wherever there is one alone, I am with him: raise the stone, and there thou shalt find me; cleave the wood, and I am there."[6]

9. One of the intercessory prayers of Jesus—that for the men who were crucifying him[7]—leads us on to yet another Divine blessing made available

[1] Mt xviii. 19 f.
[2] Mt xxviii. 20.
[3] Mc ix. 37=Mt xviii. 5=Lc ix. 48.
[4] Mt x. 40; Lc x. 16.
[5] Mt xxv. 40, 45.
[6] Ropes, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, v, p. 347 a: cf Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, pp. 22, 31, O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus* (ET), p. 61.
[7] Lc xxiii. 34.

by him—*the forgiveness of sin*. Something has already been said about Jesus' representation of God as ready to forgive sin when it is sincerely repented of.[1] We have now to study the problem a little more closely, as it engaged Jesus himself. His view of sin is not a morbid view. "Endless talk about sin and forgiveness exercises . . . a narcotic influence. To say the least of it, ethical education must move to and fro between reflection on the past (with its faults and moral bondage) and the prospects of a future (with its goal of aspiration and the exertion of all one's powers)."[2] Such a condition is amply satisfied by the method Jesus pursued. At the same time, he viewed sin as a reality, and forgiveness therefore as a necessity. Hence his repeated call for repentance,[3] and his inculcation of a daily prayer for pardon. We have already seen that Jesus often speaks of the Divine pardon with as much personal detachment as any prophet or teacher might display, and intimates that the one essential condition of it is sincere repentance. But there were other occasions on which he himself claimed to play a part in the work of forgiveness. When he was reproached with receiving sinners, he spoke the two parables of the shepherd pursuing the lost sheep and the woman seeking for the lost coin; and we cannot tell whether he meant the shepherd and the woman to represent himself or God.[4] This very ambiguity is significant for

[1] See above, pp. 33 ff.

[2] Harnack, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity* (ET), vol. i. p. 116.

[3] Mc i. 15 ‖; Lc v. 31 f ‖s. The last two words in Lc are probably an addition of his own, but they correctly represent Jesus' meaning.

[4] Lc xv. 1–10; cf Mt xviii. 12–14.

the point before us. At another time he claimed in so many words to have authority to forgive sins.[1] It is in the light of this claim that we have to read the story of the penitent prostitute, who bathed his feet with tears and perfume[2]: having been forgiven much, she loved much; and inasmuch as her love was lavished on Jesus himself, we may presume that she thought of him as the author of her forgiveness.

10. But a stiffer problem still awaits us. There is nothing in what has been quoted hitherto to suggest any *connection between Jesus' own death and the forgiveness of sins*. There is, in fact, only one passage in the Synoptic Gospels where that connection is plainly stated; and that is in a somewhat doubtful clause found in the Matthæan account of the Last Supper. Jesus says: "This (cup) is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out on behalf of many for remission of sins."[3] There is, however, another passage which, while not explicitly mentioning forgiveness, yet almost unmistakably implies it. It is that in which Jesus says: "The Son of Man came, not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life (as) a ransom for many."[4] There is strong ground for believing that this saying was a reminiscence of the prophecy about the Suffering Servant

[1] Mc ii. 5, 8–11 ||s. I agree with Mr. J. A. Robertson (*Spiritual Pilgrimage*, pp. 227–230) that we have here a real claim on Jesus' part to forgive, not simply to inform the sinner—as any of us might do—that he was forgiven. The context does not suggest that 'Son of Man' here means simply 'man' (so Lake, *Stewardship of Faith*, p. 48) nearly so strongly as it does in Mc ii. 28 (see above, p. 44 n 8).

[2] Lc vii. 36–50.

[3] Mt xxvi. 28. The doubt lies in the fact that the words "for remission of sins" occur in Mt only.

[4] Mc x. 45; Mt xx. 28.

of God in Isaiah liii. We know that the early Christians applied this and other Deutero-Isaianic 'Servant-prophecies' to Jesus[1]; and it is clear that their warrant for doing so lay in the consciousness and the words of Jesus himself. The heavenly voice that spoke to him at his baptism and at his transfiguration re-echoed more than one of these prophecies[2]: and at the Last Supper he actually quoted Isaiah liii. 12: "He was reckoned among the transgressors," and applied the passage to himself.[3] The words spoken on the same occasion: "The Son of Man departs, just as it has been written of him," are probably a reference to the same chapter.[4] Now there are grounds for thinking that the words about humble service and the ransom for many were uttered, not at the time at which Mark places them, but during the Last Supper.[5] If so, there is additional reason to believe, what the content of the ransom-passage in itself makes very probable, that it is yet another allusion to the Suffering Servant.[6] Now of this Servant it was written:

> Yea, for our transgressions was he pierced:
> For our iniquities was he bruised:
> The chastisement that brought us peace fell on him;
> And with his stripes we have been healed.

---

[1] Mt viii. 17, xii. 17–21; Lc ii. 32 (cf Isa xlii. 6, xlix. 6); Jn i. 29 (cf Is liii. 4, 7).

[2] Mc i. 11, ix. 7 ‖s: cf Isa xlii. 1, xliv. 2 (lxii. 4).

[3] Lc xxii. 37.

[4] Mc xiv. 21 ‖s.

[5] Lc, who rarely departs from Mc's chronology without some special reason, places the words about humility at the Supper, though he omits the ransom passage (xxii. 24–27). Cf Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 135, 140, and A. T. Cadoux, in *The Expositor*, January, 1918, p. 71.

[6] Cf Moffatt, *Theology of the Gospels*, pp. 139–149, and Sanday in Hastings' *DB* ii. p. 623.

> We had all strayed like sheep;
> We had turned everyone to his own way;
> And the Lord laid on him
> The penalty of us all.[1]

If, therefore, Jesus had this passage in mind, when he said that he came to give his life as a ransom for many, he must have in some way connected his own death very closely with the forgiveness of men's sins. This identification of himself with the 'Suffering Servant' accounts for the fact that, when the hostility of the Jews put the national acceptance he had hoped for out of the question, Jesus, though he did not conceal his own anguish and horror,[2] his sense of the wickedness of his enemies,[3] and his certainty of the calamity they were drawing upon themselves,[4] yet willingly embraced the prospect of death as part of the Divine plan,[5] pre-determined by prophecy [6] and necessary for the accomplishment of his own triumph. So when Peter tried to draw him away from the idea of martyrdom, he called him a hindrance, and told him that he looked at things only in man's way, not in God's.[7]

But in what did the triumph of the 'Suffering Servant' consist?

> Yahweh's desire will prosper in his hand:
> In consequence of his soul's travail, he will see (it prospering, and) will be satisfied:
> By his knowledge will my servant make the many righteous.[8]

---

[1] Isa liii. 5 f.
[2] Mc ii. 19 f ||s; Lc xii. 49 f; Mc xiv. 33 ff ||s.
[3] Mc xiv. 41 ||s.
[4] Mc xii. 9, xiv. 21 ||s; Lc xii. 54-xiii. 9, xix. 41–44, xxiii. 28–31.
[5] Cf Mc x. 38 f, xiv. 36 ff ||s.
[6] Mc ix. 12 f; Mt xxvi. 54, 56 ||: cf Lc xiii. 33.
[7] Mc viii. 31–33 ||.
[8] Isa liii. 10 f; see Skinner's notes in *Camb. Bible*.

In other words, the triumph of Jesus meant the salvation of men ; and inasmuch as salvation involved forgiveness, it followed that his death would be a means of forgiveness. And yet elsewhere Jesus depicts God as so loving that the only condition of obtaining His forgiveness is genuine repentance on man's part. We are therefore driven to conclude that Jesus' death brings about men's forgiveness by first bringing about their repentance. This repentance, it is true, changes God in so far as it enables Him to be reconciled to men, whereas otherwise He could not be : but to argue, as has so often been done, that Jesus' death alters God's attitude to sinners in any other sense,[1] is neither required by men's experience of His forgiveness, nor admissible in face of Jesus' own words concerning Him. Amid the bewildering variety of doctrines of the Atonement, the great fact stands out that the death of Jesus makes itself felt, in him who surveys it in a teachable spirit, as an immense inward enlightenment and stimulus, convincing him that here is a revelation of the Father's love and of his own sinfulness, showing him in the sufferings of Jesus what that sinfulness costs God, moving him penitently to ask for God's pardon,[2] kindling in him a passion for obedience and service, implanting in him a love for

[1] Cf A. Lyttleton in *Lux Mundi*, p. 211 : " The reconciliation to be effected is not merely the reconciliation of man to God by the change wrought in man's rebellious nature, but it is also the propitiation of God Himself, whose wrath unappeased and whose justice unsatisfied are the barriers thrown across the sinner's path to restoration."

[2] As Clemens of Rome says : " The blood of Christ . . ., being poured out for the sake of our salvation, offered to the whole world *the grace of repentance* " (*Ep. to Corinth.*, vii. 4).

his fellows, and prompting him to seek and find the Divine fellowship.

> Gazing thus, our sin we see,
> Learn Thy love while gazing thus—
> Sin which laid the cross on Thee,
> Love which bore the cross for us.
>
> Here we learn to serve and give,
> And, rejoicing, self deny;
> Here we gather love to live,
> Here we gather faith to die.

Some of the theological and devotional language of the evangelicalism of the past may need in these days to be discarded, or at least modified: but most of it does justice in a rough way to these central facts of experience.

Traditional theories of the Atonement, from Paul downwards, have had the effect, not only of obscuring the simple psychological facts of the case, but of introducing a too absolute cleavage between the sufferings of Jesus and the sufferings of others in the cause of righteousness. Theology has disguised the fact that the death of Jesus could have become the power it has become in human life only by being in the first place a supremely right and noble moral act. Neander truly says: "There must be a right conception of Christ's self-sacrifice as a moral act, in connection with his whole calling, in order to any just *doctrinal* view of his sufferings." [1] But this is just what, in the Christian theologies on the subject, has been conspicuously lacking. Orthodox theorists have objected to describing the death of Jesus as what in its historical conditions it clearly was, viz: a martyrdom brought about like

[1] *Life of Jesus Christ* (ET, 1880), p. 380.

other martyrdoms.[1] And when once the *modus operandi* of the Divine grace bestowed upon us in the shed blood of Jesus is clearly discerned, we see how exactly identical it is with the *modus operandi* of the grace bestowed upon us through the sufferings of all good people. The saving death of Jesus differs from that of other martyrs only in primacy and in degree of effectiveness, not in method of operation. Their deaths, like his, come about in the plain performance of duty; like his, theirs reveal the Divine Love and stir the consciousness of sin and the passion for righteousness. But neither his nor theirs makes God more loving and forgiving than He was before; and neither his nor theirs overrides the free will of the sinner or does away with the need for moral response on his part. When Jesus called on his followers to take up the cross and follow him,[2] he clearly implied that what he was going to do by his death, they also were to do, each in his own measure, by their deaths. The best comment on his words is the repeated testimony of early Christian authors that martyrdom under persecution invariably attracted new converts: i.e. it brought sinners to God. It was the great merit of Origenes that, despite the trammels of the imperfect theology of his day, he boldly ascribed to the deaths of the martyrs a measure of that saving efficacy which all Christians ascribe to the death of Jesus. "As those," he says, "who attended at the altar (erected) according to the law of Moses

[1] See, for instance, the remarks of Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, i. p. 86 n 3 and 328 n 1; Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, pp. 259 f; Dale, *The Atonement*, pp. 57–60, 78.

[2] Mt x. 38, xvi. 24 ||s.

were thought to administer to them forgiveness of sins by means of the blood of bulls and goats, so 'the souls of those who have been beheaded' on account of the testimony (they bore) to Jesus, attending to good purpose at the altar in heaven, administer forgiveness of sins to those who pray.[1] And besides that, we know that, just as Jesus Christ, the High Priest, offered himself up (as) a sacrifice, so the priests, whose High Priest he is, offer up themselves (as) a sacrifice.[2] . . . Perhaps also, just as we have been purchased 'by the precious blood' of Jesus, . . . so, 'by the precious blood' of the martyrs will some be purchased, (the martyrs) themselves being more exalted than those who have become righteous, but have not been martyrs. For it is reasonable that death by martyrdom should be called exaltation in a special sense, as (is) clear from the (words): 'If I am exalted from the earth, I will draw all men to myself.'"[3] And again: "If the lamb, which is given (up) for the purification of the people, is referred to the person of our Lord and Saviour, it seems consistent that the other animals also, which are assigned to the same purificatory uses, ought similarly to be referred to some persons who[4] confer something of purification on the human race"; and more to the same effect.[5]

Nor do we need to limit this fellowship in the re-

[1] The words might also be translated: "serve (or help) those who pray for forgiveness of sins," but the wording of the previous clause makes this rendering less likely. The reference is to Rev vi. 9 (xx. 4).

[2] Origenes, *Exhort. to Martyrdom*, 30 (Lommatzsch, xx. 274 f).

[3] *ibid* 50 (Lomm. xx. 314 f).

[4] At this point some MSS insert *per meritum sanguinis Christi*—almost certainly a gloss inserted by translator or copyist.

[5] Origenes, *Homilies on Numbers*, xxiv. 1. (Lomm. x. 292 f.)

demptive work of Jesus to martyrs in the strict sense. We know that all human goodness, and especially that exercised at the cost of any kind of suffering or self-sacrifice, does something to reveal God to us and to draw us nearer to Him, and so administers to us in some measure that same inward cleansing which is administered by the death of a martyr and pre-eminently by the death of Jesus.[1] "Why suffering should in this way be essential to life," says Kirsopp Lake, "we do not know, but whereas the figure of the suffering God in a suffering world may prove . . . to be irreconcilable with the traditional conception of omnipotence, it does not outrage the sense of justice. . . . The doctrine of the Atonement . . . has its permanent place in human thought, but the churches will retain the privilege of being its exponents only if they prove equal to the task of beginning its explanation with the facts of living experience, and place the suffering of Jesus within and not without the ever-widening circle of suffering yet redeeming and triumphant life. If the churches prove unequal to their task, and sacrifice the truth of experience to the tradition of expression, the world will pass them by and listen by preference to men and societies who are more alive to the necessities of the present."[2] We cannot but believe that God Himself feels all the suffering of His children; and thus the chastening and uplifting vision of

[1] "Death has a strange power over the human imagination and memory. . . . If a significant death is added to a brave and self-sacrificing life, the effect is great" (Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, p. 270). "But how did the suffering of the innocent avail to save the guilty? It saved them by opening their eyes" (Dr. Orchard, quoted in *The Crusader*, May 28, 1920, p. 9).

[2] *Stewardship of Faith*, p. 165 f.

His fatherly love and patience and sorrow and hope is granted to us in some measure in every spectacle of human goodness that meets us. We see it in the gentle mother's toil for her little ones: we see it in the patient ministry of father or friend: we see it in all faithful and conscientious daily work, in every unselfish service, in every gallant act of rescue, in all painstaking search for truth, in all brave adherence to high principle, in all endurance of suffering in the cause of righteousness.

> Yet thou more bright than all that Angel Blaze,
> Despiséd Galilæan! Man of Woes!
> For chiefly in the oppressed Good Man's face
> The Great Invisible (by symbols seen)
> Shines with peculiar and concentred light,
> When all of Self regardless the scourg'd Saint
> Mourns for th' oppressor. O thou meekest Man!
> Meek Man and lowliest of the Sons of Men!
> Who thee beheld thy imag'd Father saw.[1]

[1] Coleridge, *Religious Musings*. Mr. H. G. Wells (*God the Invisible King*, pp. 118–123) repudiates on behalf of the modern man both the Cross and its counterpart, the doctrine of non-resistance, because he does not understand either of them. That is not altogether his fault, for Christian teaching on these matters has not hitherto been a model of lucidity. At the same time, it is not hard to see where he has gone astray. In his scale of values the picture of God as a courageous militant being, incapable of gentleness or sorrow, and anxious only to conquer His enemies, stands higher than the picture of God as an eternally loving and patient Father anxious only to be reconciled with His children. It is of course quite permissible to conceive of the Father's work of reconciliation under the figure of a courageous fight: but with Mr. Wells this simile so fills the canvas that no room is left for the truth of which it is only the illustration. Consequently he does not see that the Cross, with its revelation of God's infinite love and patience and willingness to suffer for us, is but the leading type of that weapon with which He is eternally fighting against the selfishness and waywardness of man. Neither does he see that non-resistance, which he obviously equates with languor and helplessness and inactivity, is but one side of a mode of fighting wherein we "smite the foe with Christ's all-conquering kiss."

11. It is a commonplace of Gospel-study that Jesus depicted himself as *the inaugurator of the Kingdom of God*—that reign of God which was going to supervene upon all the iniquities and miseries of human society. The constant burden of his preaching as well as that of his apostles, was the imminence of the Kingdom.[1] His exorcisms were evidence that it had already come.[2] His personal instructions were its mysteries.[3] Whoever was far from him was far from it.[4] In the parables of the Kingdom, his own work figures as the sowing of seed and the use of leaven. Peter gets the keys of the Kingdom given him, immediately on recognizing Jesus' Messiahship.[5] The Kingdom of God was Jesus' favourite summary for all that he stood for. Our examination of the various aspects of his ministry has shown us in what large measure that ministry is still a living reality available for us to-day. It is when we come to the way in which Jesus conceived of the manner and form of his triumph that a modern disciple has to make the biggest discount on the score of differences between that age and this. For there seems no doubt that Jesus expected to return to earth—probably in visible bodily form—within a very short time of his decease. The third day on which he said he would rise from the dead[6] probably meant simply a short indefinite period, the exact length of which is not known—as it often did in

[1] Mc i. 15 ‖; Mt x. 7; Lc x. 9–11.
[2] Mt xii. 28 ‖.
[3] Mt xiii. 11 ff ‖s.
[4] Agraphon: see Hastings' *DB* v. 349 f (No. 62).
[5] Mt xvi. 16–19.
[6] Mc viii. 31, ix. 31, x 34 ‖s: Mt xxvii. 63 ‖.

Jewish speech [1]; and the resurrection he foretold was probably identical in his mind with his coming on the clouds of heaven with great power and glory.[2] The day and hour of that coming none knew but

[1] 2 Kings xx. 8; Hosea vi. 1 f; Lc xiii. 32 f; Mt xxvi. 61, xxvii. 40 ||s; Jn ii. 19 f; Mc xiii. 2 (Codex D); (? add Acts ix. 9, xxviii. 7, 12, 17, Jn ii. 1).

[2] The main ground for this identification is that it is hard to account for the language of Jesus when he clearly has the Parousia in mind (e.g. in his numerous comparisons of his disciples to servants working in the temporary absence of their master, and still more in his farewell words at the Last Supper—Mc xiv. 25 ||s) on the assumption that he knew all the time that the interval of absence between Death and Parousia would be broken by a period of intercourse with the disciples, commencing actually two days after his death and lasting forty days. The fact that certain appearances did commence on what was literally the third day (as then reckoned) would easily account for the difference in the way in which prophesies in regard to Resurrection and Parousia are recorded, and for the insertion of Mc xiv. 28, which is out of keeping with the *implications* of verse 25 and is omitted by Lc.

It is not usually realized that the words addressed by Jesus to the penitent robber: "*To-day* thou shalt be with me *in Paradise*" (Lc xxiii. 43) are irreconcilable with the usual idea of the resurrection and still more so with the belief that Jesus went and visited the spirits in Hades. The traditional idea of a bodily Ascension, which has no support in Mc (i.e. in what we have of him—for the original ending of his Gospel is lost), Mt, Jn (for in John the Ascension takes place before the resurrection-appearances are over: see xx. 17, cf 27), or Paul, seems to have sprung from a natural desire to provide a fitting termination to the resurrection-appearances. It need hardly be said that to regard the resurrection-appearances as psychical phenomena, not involving the presence of Jesus' physical body, does not by any means rob them of their reality, objectivity, or religious value. At most it demands modifications in some details of the narratives. Lastly, two important facts must not be overlooked: (1) the ordinary Jew, unlike the Platonic Greek and the modern Christian, was psychologically incapable of believing in a life after death without an accompanying bodily resurrection; (2) Paul evidently regarded the appearance of the Risen Christ to himself on the road to Damascus as in all respects similar to his appearances to the other disciples (1 Cor xv. 3–8).

the Father[1]: but Jesus was sure it would occur within that generation.[2] On his arrival he would call his servants to account, hold a judgment, and inaugurate his final triumph.[3] To the modern Christian, all this sounds alien and unreal, almost as much as it did to the writer of the Fourth Gospel. Allowance has to be made for the fact that the scientific and cosmological ideas of the Jewish people of that day were as much part of the habit of Jesus' mind, as the clothes he wore were the habit of his body. In adapting our Lord's eschatology to the needs of our own minds, we are bound to substitute inward spiritual fellowship with him for his return on the clouds of heaven, the silent operation of God's laws for the great Day of Judgment, the future life of the individual after death and the gradual spread of the Kingdom on earth ("the Logos ever taking possession of more (and more) souls"[4]) for the sudden erection of the Kingdom by a cataclysmic, Divine intervention. But these are all modifications of the form, not of the substance. We share our Master's invincible certainty of triumph, based on his invincible confidence in God.

O glorious Will of God, unfold
  The splendour of Thy Way,
And all shall love as they behold
  And loving shall obey,
Consumed each meaner care and claim
In the new passion's holy flame.

---

[1] Mc xiii. 32 ||. [2] Mc ix. 1, xiii. 30 f ||s.

[3] Mc viii. 35, 38; Mt x. 32 f, xiii. 41–43, 49 f, xx. 21–23, xxii. 1–14, xxv ||s: also the many words about watchful servants (see below, p. 114).

[4] Origenes, *Contra Celsum*, viii. 68 fin.

O speed the hours when o'er the world
  The vision's fire shall run;
Night from his ancient throne is hurled,
  Uprisen is Christ the Sun;
Through human wills by Thee controlled,
Spreads o'er the earth the Age of Gold.

III

HUMAN DUTY

A. *DUTY IN GENERAL*

1. A RECENT writer, in contrasting Jesus' view of religion with that of the Pharisees, tells us that the "reckoning of *religion as duty*, and nothing else, Jesus says is an abomination to God." [1] This statement is true only if the meaning of the word 'duty' be confined to the external acts of the body. It is usual to assume that the Pharisees of Jesus' day regularly limited the idea in this superficial way, though it may be questioned whether the assumption is altogether fair. It is not, however, our present purpose to discuss exactly what the Pharisees were guilty of: but it is important for us to avoid an error to which the age-long polemic against Jewish legalism had made us particularly susceptible. When we give the word 'duty' its true meaning and realize that it covers the whole of life, the mind and spirit as well as the body, faith and prayer and fellowship with God and sincerity of purpose as well as outward conduct, the danger incident to regarding it as co-extensive with religion disappears. How wide a scope Jesus gave to the idea is seen in his parable of the slave, whose whole time belongs to

[1] J. H. Robertson, *Spiritual Pilgrimage*, p. 97 (italics mine).

his Master, and who has, strictly speaking, no time he can call his own. "So likewise ye," says Jesus, "when ye have done all the things that are commanded you, say: 'We are (merely) slaves: we have (simply) done what we ought to have done.'" [1] When we realize that 'the things that are commanded' by Jesus cover the whole of the inner as well as the outer life, the motive as well as the act, we see what a much wider scope Jesus gave to the concept of duty than Protestant apologists have generally admitted. The mature child of God, even when he has fulfilled the whole of Jesus' ideal of perfection, is still to say, like Sir Richard Grenville, "I have only done my duty as a man is bound to do."

2. What, then, are *the leading characteristics of duty* as Jesus conceives it? It is that for which we must be as solicitous as we are for food and drink.[2] It is primarily concerned with the inward life as the basis and source of the outer [3]: the heart must be pure,[4] the eye single [5]: the heart will be where its treasures are, and these must be stored up in heaven [6]: the tree itself must be made good, in

[1] Lc xvii. 7–10. The insertion of the word 'unprofitable' (absent from the Sinaitic Syriac) obscures the point of the parable, gives the phrase 'unprofitable slave' quite a different meaning from what it has in Mt xxv. 30 (the other only place where it occurs), and suggests a distinction between 'duty' and the quest for perfection, which is quite foreign to the teaching of Jesus (Mt v. 48; the phrase in Mt xix. 21 'If thou wouldst be perfect' is absent from Mc and Lc, and seems to be a modification due to the compiler of the Gospel), though it survives in the Catholic doctrine of works of supererogation. A denial of this doctrine does not, of course, imply that the same form of perfection is within the reach of all at any given time.

[2] Mt v. 6. [3] Mt v. 21 f, 27 f, etc. [4] Mt v. 8.
[5] Mt vi. 22 f ||. [6] Mt vi. 19–21 ||.

order that the fruit may be good—for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks [1]: it is from within, out of the heart of man, that proceed all the evil designs that defile him.[2] So far is duty from consisting only in restraints and prohibitions, that the position of a man whose mind is empty of a positive purpose having 'the expulsive power of a new affection,' is one of extreme danger.[3] It involves difficulty and self-sacrifice: "Enter through the narrow gate, for wide is the gate and broad the road that leads to perdition, and there are many who enter through it: but narrow is the gate and cramped the road that leads to life, and few there are who find it." [4] Jesus speaks pictorially of our having to cut off a hand or a foot or pluck out an eye, if it cause us to stumble and so threaten to exclude us from the Kingdom.[5] At the same time, Jesus calls his yoke 'kindly' and his burden 'light,' [6] because alongside of the pain of sacrifice, there is the 'great reward in heaven'—the joy of fellowship and co-operation with Him we love and serve. At the very forefront on the Sermon on the Mount stand the Beatitudes, declaring the bliss of those who enter the Kingdom. "How happily the working days in this dear service fly!" This is the spirit of Dickens' Esther Summerson: "'Once more, duty, duty, Esther,' said I; 'and if you are not overjoyed to do it, more than cheerfully and contentedly, through anything and everything, you ought to be. That's all I have to say to *you*, my dear.'" [7]

[1] Mt xii. 33–36; Lc vi. 43–45. [2] Mc vii. 14 f, 18–23 ||.
[3] So perhaps we may paraphrase Mt xii. 43–45 ||.
[4] Mt vii. 13 f ||. [5] Mt v. 29 f, xviii. 8 f ||.
[6] Mt xi. 30. [7] *Bleak House*, ch. 38.

B. *THE OBSERVANCES OF RELIGION*

1. To the Jew the connexion between the essence of religion and its *ceremonial expression* was very close—so close that the natural tendency with many was to identify the two, and even to regard the ceremonial side as virtually the whole of religion. That the experiences and activities of the religious spirit need to be expressed in appropriate religious observances, in order that they may be kept clear and lively, ought to be obvious to us from the need of such external expressions in other departments of life. A religion altogether without observances would be like a friendship without handshakes and letters, or an engagement without kisses. The Jews of Jesus' day had an elaborate and venerable system of religious observances—those enjoined by the so-called Law of Moses—and we find Jesus paying a good deal of respect to that system. At the early age of twelve, he feels the need of being in his Father's house—the Temple at Jerusalem.[1] Later in life he wears on his garment the fringe prescribed by the Law,[2] bids the cured lepers show themselves to the priest and offer the sacrifices that Moses commanded,[3] pays the Temple-tax in order not to scandalize the authorities,[4] bids the disciples obey

[1] Lc ii. 49.

[2] Mt ix. 20, xiv. 36 ‖ s (Greek) : cf Numb xv. 38 ; Deut xxii. 12 ; Mt xxiii. 5.

[3] Mc i. 44 ‖s ; Lc xvii. 14.

[4] Mt xvii. 24–27.

the Pharisees because they sit in Moses' seat, and declares that he has not come to abrogate the Law but to fulfil it.[1] He says explicitly that men ought not to neglect even the less weighty matters of the Law.[2]

2. At the same time Jesus was aware of the subtle danger of regarding these observances as if they formed *the stuff and substance of religion.* Though we need not suppose that every Pharisee and religious Jew was a humbug with no sense of the demands of true morality, there is no doubt that many were in danger of dropping into this attitude. To counteract and correct the distorted view that made the danger so real was Jesus' constant effort. More than once he referred his critics to God's prophetic utterance: "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice."[3] He insisted that a man was defiled, not by eating with dirty hands, or by anything that entered him from without, but by the immoral designs that issue from his own heart.[4] If the usual interpretation of the words about the new patch on the old garment and the new wine in the old bottles[5] be correct, he was conscious of a certain incongruity between his own teaching and the Jewish system. He condemned in unsparing terms the public and ostentatious performance of religious duty, like

[1] Mt xxiii. 2 f, v. 17 f ||. The exact meaning, and even the genuineness, of these two passages, is somewhat doubtful.

[2] Mt xxiii. 23 ||. But see below, note 4.

[3] Mt ix. 13, xii. 7.

[4] Mt. xv. 10–20 ||. Jesus' argument that a man is not defiled by what he eats is hardly in keeping with the dietary laws in the Pentateuch, though how the disregard of these was to be harmonized with that deference for the Law which Jesus elsewhere professed (see notes 1 and 2 above), it is hard to say.

[5] Mc ii. 21 f ||s.

prayer, almsgiving, and fasting, with the object of winning a reputation for piety.[1] He blamed the Scribes for loading men's shoulders with burdens heavy and hard to bear.[2] He condemned the scrupulous care bestowed on tithing herbs, when the weightier matters of the Law—justice, mercy, and faith—were being neglected.[3] A worshipper who has wronged his neighbour ought to leave his sacrifice at the altar and go and make amends, and come back to sacrifice only after the reconciliation has been effected.[4]

3. The one religious observance which Jesus discussed in any detail was *the Sabbath*; and his attitude towards it is a good illustration of his attitude towards the ceremonial side of religion in general. There is no reason to suppose that he wished to abolish Sabbath-observance. As a day for the general cessation of ordinary work, and for the cultivation of the inward life, it was a blessing which men ought not to deny themselves. "The Sabbath came into being," he said, "for man's sake."[5] At the same time, he would not have the demands of brotherly love and service subordinated to those of Sabbath-observance. He set the seal of his approval on that natural instinct that bids us relieve the suffering and supply the needs of ourselves and of others—Sabbath or no Sabbath, and he desired that instinct to be carried to its logical conclusion.[6] Had Jesus been asked by a

[1] Mt vi. 1–6, 16–18.

[2] Mt xxiii. 4=Lc xi. 46: cf Ac xv. 10.

[3] Mt xxiii. 23 f; Lc xi. 42. Cf his similar complaint of the lack of a sense of proportion in the matter of swearing oaths in Mt xxiii. 16–22.

[4] Mt v. 23 f.

[5] Mc ii. 27.

[6] Mc ii. 23–iii. 5 ||s; Lc xiii. 10–17, xiv. 1–6.

modern Christian whether he approved of Sunday tennis and Sunday golf, I am sure he would at once have carried the question to a higher level, and asked the questioner whether he was conscientiously making the best use of the opportunities Sunday gave him for resting his body and exercising his soul. An old narrative tells us that he once saw a man working on the Sabbath, and said to him: "(My) man, if thou knowest what thou art doing, happy art thou; but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the Law."[1] That is to say, the precepts of the ceremonial law are binding, but only in so far as they do not traverse some requirement that commends itself to our best judgment as being more in accordance with the Divine Will.

[1] The words are found only in Codex Bezæ (at Cambridge) at Lc vi. 4. They probably reflect a true tradition.

C. *OUR DUTY TO GOD*

1. TURNING now to the more essential and fundamental duties owed to God, we see that Jesus puts in the foremost place the act which is represented in our English translation as '*repentance*,' but which is more correctly described by some such term as 'change of mind' or 'change of heart.' We scarcely need to be reminded how frequently Jesus demands it. He opens his ministry with a general call to repentance on account of the nearness of God's Kingdom [1]; he said that the purpose of his coming was to call sinners to repentance [2]; he was grieved and surprised that the cities in which he worked repented not—surely Tyre and Sidon and Nineveh would have done so [3]; he told the disciples to pray daily for the forgiveness of their sins [4]; he warned men that, unless they repented, they would perish [5]; but told them that there was joy in heaven over even one repentant sinner.[6]

But if repentance really means a change of mind, clearly we are in need of some details as to the nature of the change. What sort of change is indicated by repentance? One thing is clear: it is a change

[1] Mc i. 15; Mt iv. 17. [2] See p. 57 n 3.

[3] Mt xi. 21, xii. 41 ||s.

[4] Mt vi. 9, 12 ||. Cf Lc xviii. 13 f, where the Pharisee's prayer leads to no justification, because he did not realize any need to ask for pardon.

[5] Lc xiii. 1–9. [6] Lc xv. 7, 10.

appropriate for sinners; for in most of the passages we have quoted, it is sinners who are spoken of as repenting, or needing to repent. What then is a sinner? In order to answer this question, we need to remember that the Jewish conception of sin was a good deal wider than that usually held by the modern Christian.

Sin.

According to the latter, sin is something for which the sinner is responsible, is to blame, something he would be able to avoid were it not for a corrupted will; it is the open-eyed and deliberate choice of wrong, while the right is staring him in the face. "Video meliora proboque; deteriora sequor." That this view covers a certain number of the facts, no one will deny: we can all look back with shame on acts and omissions that we can characterize in these terms. But will anyone maintain that this view of sin is at all adequate to the problems of man's moral consciousness? What about that large crowd of acts, words, and thoughts, which we sorely regret and yet never meant to be guilty of, in excuse for which we could quite fairly plead youth or inexperience or ignorance or oversight or lapse of memory or haste or illness or human frailty or provocation or fatigue, but which yet we cannot quite class as mere accidents over which we had no control—things which seem to be at the same time both inevitable and optional, the errors without which we cannot learn, the falls without which, though we have the best intentions in the world, we can never be taught to stand upright? Ignorance and inexperience we know; the weakness of the flesh when the spirit is willing we know; and wilful wrongdoing we know. Perhaps we know too that these are not all

the same. But who can point out to us the dividing lines between them? Who can show us where one begins and the other ends? The focus is not sharp enough to enable us to mark outlines.[1]

It was with a deep sense of this undefinable and unaccountable character of sin that the Old Testament writers thought of it—not only as something wilful and outrageous, but also as something well-nigh as inseparable from human life as is growth itself. That sharp division which modern theology tries to draw between intellectual ignorance and moral faultiness the Old Testament authors knew perfectly well could not be drawn. The Hebrew word, like the Greek word, for sin meant primarily to miss a mark, goal, or way. "The etymology . . . does not necessarily imply intentional wrongdoing."[2] Atonement for unintentional sin—and that not only in matters of ritual—was expressly provided for in the Priestly Code.[3] The conception of sin as inseparable from human nature, as incriminating and yet in a measure inevitable, as bringing a sense of the need of pardon, and yet as in a measure beyond man's control, pervades the devotional literature of the Old Testament. "There is no man that sinneth not."[4] "What is man, that he should be clean, and he who is born of a woman,

[1] Cf the interesting accounts of sin from the modern point of view in H. G. Wells' *God the Invisible King*, pp. 171 ff ("It is in the nature of every man to fall short at every point from perfection," etc), and in K. Lake's *Stewardship of Faith*, pp. 184–186. We must not assume that Paul's, Augustine's, and Luther's view of sin is necessarily involved in the normal Christian experience of it (cf W. R. Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, p. 214).

[2] E. R. Bernard in Hastings' *DB* iv. p. 529 a.

[3] Lev iv. 2 ff, v. 14–19; Numb xv. 22–31.

[4] 1 Kings viii. 46.

that he should be righteous? Behold, He putteth no trust in His holy ones; yea, the heavens are not clean in His sight."[1] "Errors—who can understand? Cleanse me from hidden (fault)s: keep back thy servants also from rebellious (act)s; let them not rule over me."[2] "Thou hast set our iniquities before Thee, our secret sins in the light of Thy face."[3] "Sinfulness," says Philo, "is congenital to everything born, in proportion as it has entered into being, even though it be good."[4]

Sin, therefore, according both to the Old Testament and to modern experience, covers the whole of life's spiritual and moral imperfections and limitations. And if we remember how thoroughly scriptural Jesus' whole education had been, and at the same time how deeply rooted in actual human experience his religious convictions were, and if we bear in mind that his great ideal for man was that he should become and should be called a Son of the Most High, we can with some confidence say that sin must have meant for him anything that hinders the realization of this ideal. That being so, 'repentance' would be the initial change needed for this realization, i.e. man's discernment of his true destiny as a prospective child of God and the surrender of himself to the fulfilment of that destiny as his life's aim. Repentance therefore is in essence the catching sight of the goal and the conscious start towards it. It is not therefore necessarily the expression of regret for any overt or specific or wilful

[1] Job xv. 14 f: cf xxv. 4, xxxiv. 31 f.

[2] Ps xix. 12 f. Cheyne's note is: "*Lapses*, i.e. errors due to ignorance or inattention, opposed (as in the Levitical Law) to 'presumptuous sins'" (*The Book of Psalms*, p. 221).

[3] Ps xc. 8.

[4] *Vita Mosis*, l. III, s. 17.

acts of wrongdoing, though of course it may be that.[1] Nor is it necessarily to be regarded as a sudden or momentary or dateable experience ; though often it is so and, even where it seems to be a long gradual process, there is probably some specific time when the true state of things first dawns clearly on the man's soul. Thus explained, repentance is obviously a necessity for every man ; and if conversion means the same thing, then obviously all men need to be converted ![2]

2. Repentance then is the yielding to God's call to live as His child—it is the birth (or re-birth[3]) of the filial spirit. Now the first essential to the filial spirit is the child's *love* for his father. Hence we find Jesus saying that the first commandment of all is : " Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength."[4] Among what Jesus called the weightier matters of the Law, he names ' love for God,' and we can see that he reckoned it the chief of them.[5] Those who are always decrying the legal aspect of religion, who are never weary of telling us that we are not under law but under grace, to whom the bare mention of anything in the nature of a definite and binding precept seems like a

[1] " Repentance is not necessarily equivalent to pain and broken-heartedness " (O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus* (ET), p. 215).

[2] Professor Lake (*Stewardship of Faith*, p. 28) thinks Jesus was not speaking ironically when he spoke of the righteous who need no repentance (Lc xv. 7) and the healthy who need no doctor (Mc ii. 17 ||s). But if so, he is referring to those who have repented already ; and even they have to *re-affirm* their repentance in the daily prayer for forgiveness (Mt vi. 9, 12 ||).

[3] As in the case of the Prodigal Son (Lc xv. 17–21).

[4] Mc xii. 28–34 ||s.

[5] Lc xi. 42 : but cf Mt xxiii. 23.

lapse from evangelical truth, have never been able to explain satisfactorily why it is that so inward and spiritual and apparently involuntary an act as love, should be made by Jesus the subject of a direct imperative, that is to say, a law. We do no violation, however, to Jesus' teaching when we say that 'love for God' is one (and that the chief) of our duties. If it be true to call love an emotion, then we must have a psychology of religion that brings the emotions under the control of the will; for loving, according to Jesus, is something we can do as a matter of duty. What love for God really means is hard to define—perhaps the best we can do is to avail ourselves of human analogies. In some respects the experience of 'falling in love' is closely analogous to the love which God requires of us: but on the whole the comparison is not felicitous, as will be seen, for instance, by the way in which efforts to make suitable people fall in love with one another as a matter of duty, invariably come to grief: (well may Hermia protest, "O hell! to choose love by another's eyes"). Our best illustration is, as we might expect, the love of a little child for a good father or mother. "Wherefore," as says Paul in the language of childhood, "we are ambitious, whether at home or abroad, to be well-pleasing to Him."[1]

Another popular fallacy is that we must not love God for hope of reward.

> My God I love thee, not because
> I hope for heaven thereby.

The lines recall an utterance of Sancho Panza's in *Don Quixote*: "'I have heard it preached,' quoth

[1] 2 Cor v. 9.

Sancho, 'that God is to be loved with this kind of love, for Himself alone, without our being moved to it by hope of reward or fear of punishment; though, for my part, I am inclined to love and serve Him for what He is able to do for me.'"[1] Now, whether or no we ought to love God for hope of reward seems to depend entirely on our idea of 'reward.' And whether Sancho had a worthy idea of that, we do not know. But we do know that most of what Jesus says about the motives that should guide human duty is in the language of reward and punishment[2]; and if we had worthy thoughts about the nature of the 'reward,' the 'treasure in heaven,' 'the things which eye hath not seen and ear hath not heard, and which have not entered into the heart of man, whatsoever things God hath prepared for those that love Him,'[3] we should not need to seek for any other motive or basis for this first and greatest of all Christian duties.[4]

3. Love for God has many *different aspects*. It involves worship, such as can be paid to God alone.[5] It involves fear—fear lest we should incur His displeasure,[6] or, to use words more in accordance with our modern temper, but meaning the same, fear lest we should grieve Him. It involves reverence—the keeping sacred of God's name[7]; the refusal to

[1] *Don Quxiote*, Part I, bk. iv, ch. 31.

[2] See above, pp. 40–43.

[3] 1 Cor ii. 9.

[4] On the hope of reward as the inducement to right action in general, cf Isaac Taylor, *The Natural History of Enthusiasm* (1829), pp. 173–179, Ottley in *Lux Mundi*, pp. 352 ff, and a frank paper by Canon A. C. Deane on 'The Christian Doctrine of Reward' in *The Expositor* for December, 1919, pp. 412–418.

[5] Mt iv. 10 ||.

[6] Mt x. 28 ||; cf Lc xviii. 2, 4.

[7] Mt vi. 9 ||.

swear either by His throne or by His footstool or by His city [1]; the abstention from blasphemy, particularly against His Holy Spirit.[2]

4. Its content can be aptly summed up in two or three different ways. It involves in the first place *obedience*. "Keep the commandments," says Jesus [3]; and elsewhere he calls the commandments the word of God.[4] "Happy (are) those who hear the word of God, and keep (it)."[5] He blames the Jews for neglecting the commandments of God out of deference to human traditions and precepts.[6] Under this heading perhaps we should place that duty of which Jesus says a good deal, viz: the duty of accepting God's prophets.[7] The prophets figure in his Vineyard Parable as the owner's servants sent to the vine-dressers to collect their master's share of the produce.[8] They figure also in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus as providing sufficient warning for the Rich Man's five brothers.[9] John the Baptist was a prophet and yet the religious leaders of the nation had rejected him.[10] The charge of slaying God's prophets was a capital item in Jesus' indictment of the nation.[11] On the question as to how the false prophet was to be distinguished from the true, Jesus only says that they are to be known by their fruits.[12] Presumably he would have referred the question to the

[1] Mt v. 33–35: cf xxiii. 16–22. Note however that Jesus broke his silence at his trial and answered the High Priest as soon as he 'adjured' him in God's Name (Mt xxvi. 62–64 ||: cf Levit v. 1).
[2] Mc iii. 28 f ||s. [3] Mt xix. 17 ||s. [4] Mc vii. 6–13 ||.
[5] Lc xi. 28. [6] See note 4. [7] Mt x. 41.
[8] Mc xii. 1–5 ||s. [9] Lc xvi. 27–31.
[10] Mt xi. 9 ff ||, xxi. 25 f ||, 28–32; Lc vii. 30.
[11] Lc xiii. 33 f ||; Mt xxii. 6 f, xxiii. 29–37 ||; Mc xii. 3–5 ||s.
[12] Mt vii. 15–20 ||.

questioner's own heart. If we truly love God, we shall recognize His prophets well enough when we see them.

5. Further, love for God involves the quest for His righteousness,[1] the due payment of what belongs to Him,[2] and especially the *imitation of His perfect goodness.* "Love your enemies, and pray for those who persecute you, in order that ye may become sons of your Father in heaven, for He raises His sun on evil and good (alike), and sends rain on (the) righteous and (the) unrighteous. . . . Ye then shall be perfect, just as your heavenly Father is perfect."[3] It is worth noticing in passing that, though Jesus elsewhere represents God as punishing the wicked,[4] yet when he is speaking of our imitating God, he confines himself to God's beneficence. God has prerogatives of discipline which His children do not share and must not try to copy, just as the children in a family are not allowed to punish one another. This agrees incidentally with Paul's counsel at the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth chapters of Romans—but we must leave over further discussion of the point until a later stage.[5]

6. But Jesus' favourite formula for summing up man's duty to God was *the doing of God's Will.* We are to pray daily for it to be done on earth.[6] We must do it ourselves,[7] even if it means draining the bitter cup of sorrow to the dregs.[8] Only those that do it can enter the Kingdom of Heaven,[9] or claim to be Jesus' true brethren.[10] God's Will is

[1] Mt vi. 33 ||.
[2] Mc xii. 17 ||s; cf Mt xxi. 41.
[3] Mt v. 44 f, 48.
[4] Mt xviii. 34 f, xxii. 7, 13; Lc xix. 12, 14, 27; etc.
[5] See below, pp. 164, 168.
[6] Mt vi. 10 ||.
[7] Mt xxi. 28–32.
[8] Mt xxvi. 39, 42 ||s.
[9] Mt vii. 21–23.
[10] Mc iii. 33–35 ||s.

identical with human salvation: it is not His Will that one even of the humblest folk should perish.[1]

But it is all very well to ask men to do God's Will; how are they to know what that Will is? We may recall the vigorous protest of Browning's Paracelsus:

> Now, 'tis this I most admire—
> The constant talk men of your stamp keep up
> Of God's will, as they style it; one would swear
> Man had but merely to uplift his eye,
> And see the will in question charactered
> On the heaven's vault . . .
> . . . God's intimations rather fail
> In clearness than in energy: 'twere well
> Did they but indicate the course to take
> Like that to be forsaken.[2]

Does Jesus show any consciousness of the difficulty? There is one passage in which he contemplates the case of the man whose intentions are right, but whose knowledge is limited. "That slave, who knew his master's will and did not make preparation or act according to his will, will be beaten (with) many (stroke)s. But he who knew not, and did things deserving strokes, will be beaten (with) few. From everyone to whom much has been given, will much be looked for, and from him to whom they have entrusted much will they ask the more."[3] It is in the light of this charitable recognition of varying degrees of knowledge and ignorance that we have to interpret those incidents in history and in modern life where we see men and women doing

[1] Mt xviii. 14.

[2] Browning, *Works*, pp. 43–45. Cf R. D. Hampden, *The Scholastic Philosophy* (Bampton Lectures, 1832), p. 513: "To argue respecting the will of God, as if we had any positive notion of what it is in God, can lead to no practical truth: for it is to argue from a mere hypothesis."

[3] Lc xii. 47 f.

what we should judge to be contrary to God's Will, and doing it in the profound belief that it is in conformity with that Will. The crowds listening to the Pope and Peter the Hermit preaching the First Crusade, and then shouting: "It is the Will of God! It is the Will of God!"[1]—the pious Puritan, Colonel Hutchinson, deciding after long meditation and prayer to vote for Charles the First's execution, believing himself to be Divinely guided to that conclusion[2]—Nelson, starting on his last naval enterprise with the prayer 'His Will be done,'[3]—and the youthful Gladstone opposing the admission of Nonconformists to the Universities with a special consciousness of Divine help[4]—are all perhaps instances of servants who knew not their Lord's Will, or who knew it very imperfectly: and they serve to remind us that it is not given to any of us to know that Will perfectly, but to know it only in varying degrees of imperfection. Yet even the imperfect is binding on us if it is the best we can get. None of us can do better than a certain English peer of whom it was said that "he ever set before him the question—What is the will of God concerning this matter? And when, often after much prayer and diligent use of all the means at his disposal, he had satisfied himself what he ought to do, he set himself to do it without more ado."[5]

7. Like all other topics Jesus handles, this one too—the duty of man to God—is related to his

[1] Menzel, *History of Germany* (ET), i, p. 412; David Hume, quoted in *Half Hours of English History*, i, p. 296.

[2] *Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson*, ch. 16 fin.

[3] Southey, *Life of Nelson*, ch. 9. [4] Morley, *Gladstone*, i. p. 84.

[5] Character Sketch of the Earl of Carnarvon in *The Review of Reviews*, August 1890, p. 126.

conception of *the Kingdom of God*. We have to pray daily for its coming—its coming being identical with the doing of His Will.[1] We have to seek it [2]—to accept God's invitation to enter it, but not to presume that we can enter it without proper preparation or equipment.[3] Now that the Kingdom has drawn near, we have to repent, believe the good news,[4] produce the fruits of the Kingdom, i.e. righteousness,[5] become like little children in our unquestioning faith in God our Father [6]; we have to make the needful sacrifices, for entering the Kingdom is no easy task.[7] God's Kingdom is not for the man who puts his hand to the plough and looks back: [8] it can be entered only by the most strenuous exertion.[9]

8. Bearing in mind all through that the Kingdom of God means in essence the realization of God's royal rights, and that God is not only King and Master, but Father, it follows that His children, as has just been said, must have *faith* in Him, if they are to enter His Kingdom. By faith, Jesus does not mean the blind acceptance of a creed, but the child's unquestioning and unquestionable axiom :—that his

[1] Mt vi. 10 ||, vii. 21. [2] Mt vi. 33.

[3] Mt xxii. 1–14. Vv. 11–14 belong to some parable in which the Kingdom was depicted as a royal feast, but not to that in vv. 1–10; for the hastily collected guests of 9 f clearly could have had neither the means nor the time to array themselves suitably, and the idea that it was the custom for a rich host to provide raiment for his guests has no foundation (Trench, *Parables*, pp. 226–228). We are not told *here* what the real equipment for entrance into the Kingdom consisted of.

[4] Mc i. 15 ||. [5] Mt xxi. 43: cf v. 3, 6, 20.

[6] Mc x. 14 f ||s. [7] Mc x. 23–27 ||s: cf Mt v. 10, Acts xiv. 22.

[8] Lc ix. 62.

[9] Mt xi. 12; Lc xvi. 16. Cf the Agraphon: "An untempted man will not attain to the Kingdom of Heaven" (Hastings' *DB* v, p. 347 b).

father is good, and may be relied upon.[1] This faith in God's care for us is not to tempt us to take senseless risks, like flinging oneself from the pinnacle of the Temple,[2] nor is it to discourage us from working intelligently for our living; but it ought to relieve us from worry and anxiety over earthly affairs.[3] Nay more, it ought to enable us to make use of God's own limitless power, so that we can cast out the most stubborn of evil spirits,[4] and remove the most mountainous obstacles from our path.[5] Also we must bear in mind, what is only implicit in the Gospels, not explicit,[6] that for us Jesus is the author of the faith which he bids us have.[7] It is only in so far as we dwell with him in thought, in memory, in will, in contemplation, that we feel this unquestioning belief in God's goodness to be within our reach.

9. And now, lastly, a few words on the great subject of *prayer*. Jesus' own instructions on the

[1] Cf the fine statement by Scott Holland in *Lux Mundi*, pp. 9, 12, 39: "Faith is the sense in us that we are Another's creature, Another's making. . . . Faith is the attitude, the temper, of a son towards a father. . . . Such a relationship as this needs no justifying sanction beyond itself: it is its own sanction, its own authority, its own justification. . . . The willing surrender of the heart is the witness to a *fact* which is beyond argument, which accepts no denial. . . . Faith cannot transfer its business into other hands to do its work for it. It cannot request reason to take its own place. . . . It is by forgetting this that so many men are to be found . . . still hovering on the brink of faith. . . . Their suspense would break and pass, if once they remembered that, to enter the Kingdom of Heaven, they must always be as little children. They must call upon the child within them. . . ."

[2] Mt iv. 7 ||.

[3] Mt vi. 25–34 ||; Mc iv. 40 ||. See above pp. 25–27, 38–40.

[4] Mc ix. 19, 23 f ||s; Mt xvii. 19 f.

[5] Mt xvii. 20, xxi. 21 ||s.

[6] But see Lc xxii. 32: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not."

[7] Heb xii. 2.

matter are fuller and more detailed than on almost any other single duty: but they lend themselves easily to recapitulation.

Jesus is down on all prayer for show—all prayer done in public in order to earn the praise of men—all prayer that consists of vain repetition and much speaking.[1] Though he speaks of the Temple at Jerusalem as being "a house of prayer for all the nations,"[2] he himself prays anywhere—often in the open air and on the mountain-tops.[3] He contemplates his disciples praying singly in the secrecy of their own rooms at home, and also with one another in little groups.[4] He expected them to pray regularly every day, as is clear from the prayer for daily bread.[5] The sample prayer that he taught them is remarkable for its simplicity and brevity.[6] It provides a useful framework for the study of all that he says about the content of prayer.

Our prayer is addressed to our Heavenly Father,[7] the Lord of the Heaven and the earth,[8] who is great and good and wonderful beyond our comprehension. He is the Father who is in secret[9]—to whom all things are possible[10]—and whose name is to be held in reverence.[11]

The Lord's Prayer contains no explicit thanksgiving; but elsewhere we find Jesus thanking God for food and drink,[12] commending the leper who gave glory to God for his recovery,[13] and praising

[1] Mt vi. 5–9; Mc xii. 38–40 ||.
[2] Mc xi. 17||s.
[3] Mc i. 35, vi. 46; Lc v. 16, vi. 12, ix. 28 f, etc.
[4] Mt vi. 6, 9, xviii. 19 f.
[5] Mt vi. 11 ||.
[6] Mt vi. 9–13=Lc xi. 2–4.
[7] Mt vi. 9.
[8] Mt xi. 25 ||.
[9] Mt vi. 6.
[10] Mc xiv. 36.
[11] Mt vi. 9 ||.
[12] Mc vi. 41, viii. 6 f, xiv. 22 f ||s.
[13] Lc xvii. 17 f.

his Father for graciously revealing His truth to the simple.[1]

Our first petitions are to be, not for the things we desire most for our personal profit, but for the things that are nearest to God's own heart—for the coming of His Kingdom, the doing of His Will on earth, the attainment of His righteousness.[2] Thereby we begin by subordinating our own will to His ; and our prayer thus becomes an offer of service, an oath of allegiance, a declaration of our willingness to do God's Will and, if need be, to suffer for it.[3]

But to pray in these terms is not only an act of self-dedication ; it is an intercession on behalf of others. We pray that God's Will may be fulfilled, not only in ourselves, but in the lives of our fellow-men. It was thus that Jesus prayed for his murderers,[4] and bade us pray for those who persecute us,[5] and ask God to send out more labourers into His harvest.[6] If we must pray for enemies, a fortiori we must pray for friends, as Jesus prayed for Simon and for the little children and for the sufferers whom he cured.[7]

Then we are to ask God each day for our bread for the morrow—a prayer which, as already indicated more than once, does not suggest that we need not work for our bread.[8]

Then we are to pray for the forgiveness of our debts, thereby reaffirming every day, as our frailty requires

[1] Mt xi. 25 f ‖ : cf xxvi. 30 (hymn-singing).
[2] Mt vi. 10 ‖, 33 : also the Agraphon quoted on p. 26 n 2.
[3] Mt xxvi. 39, 42, 44 ‖s.
[4] Lc xxiii. 34.
[5] Mt v. 44 ; Lc vi. 28.
[6] Mt ix. 37 f ‖.
[7] See above, p. 55.
[8] Mt vi. 11 ‖ : see above, pp. 26 f, 90 : and compare the thanksgivings for food quoted on p. 91 n 12.

us to do, that repentance or change of heart, whereby we first acknowledged ourselves to be God's children and decided accordingly to live in fellowship with Him.[1] Jesus lays special stress on this prayer as if he realized how easily men went astray either in omitting to offer it altogether or in offering it wrongly. The taxgatherer who strikes his breast and says: "God be merciful to me a sinner," goes down to his house justified rather than the Pharisee who had no sense of his need for pardon.[2] More than once and with great emphasis Jesus tells men that their prayer for forgiveness will not be granted unless they forgive others who have wronged them.[3] It is not that there are two independent conditions of obtaining God's pardon—repentance and a forgiving spirit; but that the unforgiving man is so lacking in a true sense of his own shortcomings as compared with those of his neighbour that he cannot be said to have truly repented himself.[4]

When Jesus tells us to pray: "Lead us not into temptation, but rescue us from the evil one,"[5] the temptation he is apparently thinking of is affliction and persecution, rather than the mere human tendency to go wrong. The prayer is consequently analogous to that offered by Jesus himself in Gethsemane, viz: that the cup of martyrdom might, if possible, pass away from him[6]; also to that enjoined on the disciples in Gethsemane: "Watch and pray, in order that ye may not come into temptation"[7]; and also to that which he bade his followers offer

[1] Mt vi. 12 ||: see above, p. 82 n 2.
[2] Lc xviii. 10–14.
[3] Mt vi. 14 f, xviii. 21–35; Mc xi. 25.
[4] See above, p. 35.
[5] Mt vi. 13 ||.
[6] See above, p. 92 n 3.
[7] Mc xiv. 38 ||s.

when the days of great distress should come : " Pray that your flight may not occur in the winter, or on the Sabbath." [1] Jesus' own prayer on the cross, " My God, my God, why has Thou deserted me ? " [2] of which so much has been made in theories of the Atonement,[3] is indeed not easy to explain, but is more probably simply a cry of agony, uttered in the familiar language of Scripture,[4] than any admission that the speaker was vicariously guilty and so really deserted by God. Such a thought is abhorrent to Jesus' conception of God. We get his true feeling in the other prayer : " Father, into Thy hands I commit my spirit." [5]

Something has already been said [6] on the Calvinistic tone of the prayer against temptation, of the consequent difficulty of defining its exact place in modern devotions, and of the deeper question to which this, and in fact all prayer, leads us—I mean, how exactly does prayer operate ? Is it my prayer, or is it God's prompting me to pray, that is the real starting-point of that co-operation between God and myself which is a necessary condition for a righteous life ? That problem I believe to be—I will not say insoluble—but at least unsolved. But though we may be exercised—and rightly exercised—over the philosophical problem, there is no need to deny ourselves, pending its solution, the enjoyment of that help and power which prayer brings us. Of Jesus' magnificent dogmatism on the power of

[1] Mc xiii. 18 ||. [2] Mc xv. 34 ||.

[3] E.g. Dale, *The Atonement*, pp. 60–63, and pref. to 7th edition, § 4. [4] The words occur at the beginning of Ps xxii.

[5] Lc xxiii. 46. Cf Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, pp. 326 f, Halliday, *Reconciliation and Reality*, pp. 191–194, and Robertson, *Spiritual Pilgrimage*, p. 130. [6] See above, pp. 28–31.

prayer offered in unquestioning faith, we have already spoken.[1] And when we have made all necessary allowances in order to bring the form and language of our prayer as far as possible up-to-date and all necessary discount for the absolute and pictorial and often hyperbolical language of Jesus as an oriental teacher, prayer will still remain a natural and indeed inevitable practice for those who are children of God, needful not only for the purification and calming and guidance of their own spirits, but also for the infusion into them of that power without which they cannot do the Father's Will. The picture of a man who finds mountains obstructing him, which are humanly speaking insurmountable, is not an unfitting illustration of God's child living in God's own world as it is to-day ; and it is well for him to learn that the means of removing the obstacle is not only to pray, but also to live, as one who has faith as a grain of mustard-seed.

[1] See above, pp. 31–33, 56.

D. *OUR DUTY TO JESUS*

1. It is very significant that the duties which Jesus claims as due to himself from men correspond very closely with the duties he asks them to render to God. With the single exception of worship and prayer—for Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels never asks the disciples to address their prayers to him—every duty we have to render to God has corresponding to it a similar duty owed by us to Jesus himself. The same is, as we may recollect, broadly speaking true of the blessings bestowed on men. Jesus represents himself as conferring on men what he also represents God as conferring on them—help, forgiveness, rewards, and so on. In other words, Jesus pictures himself as standing to men in somewhat the same relation as that in which God stands to them. As Ritschl put it, *Jesus has for men 'the religious value of God.'*[1] To say this is not to say that Jesus *is* God—for that, as have been shown on a previous page,[2] seems to stultify much of the data with which we have to start. But it does recognize a certain historical basis in the actual consciousness of Jesus and in men's experience of him for the later problem of his 'Person' and the various theories put forward to settle it. Our task here is not to enter further upon that problem,

[1] Mackintosh, *The Person of Jesus Christ*, p. 279.
[2] See pp. 45–49.

but to analyse a little more closely the view which Jesus took of what was owing to himself, and to endeavour to see how far that view has significance for us to-day.

2. The first and most obvious demand which Jesus made on his fellow-countrymen was—that they should *accept him*, that they should admit his right to speak in the name and with the authority of God. "He who receives me receives Him who sent me."[1] "He who rejects me rejects Him who sent me."[2] When people were not impressed by what he said to them and what he did before them, he was amazed and saddened. The great sinful communities of past history like Tyre and Sidon and Sodom would never have displayed such obduracy.[3] The Ninevites had respect to the prophet Jonah, and the Queen of Sheba took the trouble to make a long journey to listen to the wise Solomon; but when Jesus, who was greater than either Solomon or Jonah, spoke to men, many of those that heard either responded with carping criticism,[4] or else forgot what they heard as soon as it was spoken.[5] His own kinsfolk and fellow-townsmen, who had the best opportunities of knowing his true worth, rejected and dishonoured him.[6] The children of Jerusalem were unwilling to respond to his call to entrust the custody and control of their lives to him.[7] Those over whom he claimed to rule declared: "We do not want this man to be king over us."[8] His fellow-countrymen were captious and hard to please.

[1] Mt x. 40; Mc ix. 37 ||s.
[2] Lc x. 16.
[3] Mt xi. 20–24 ||.
[4] Mt xii. 38–42 ||.
[5] Mc iv. 4, 15 ||s.
[6] Mc iii. 21, vi. 4 ||.
[7] Mt xxiii. 37 ||.
[8] Lc xix. 12, 14.

They rejected John the Baptist because he was an ascetic: they rejected Jesus because he was *not* an ascetic.[1] They tried his patience with their perpetual criticisms, in which their hostility was ill disguised under the garb of enquiry.[2] All this was the reverse of what he had hoped and longed for. He came to men as friend and helper; and he desired to be recognized and welcomed as such. "Happy is he," he exclaimed, "whosoever is not repelled by me."[3] Neutrality towards himself he did not recognize as possible. When once he had made his claim heard in a man's ears, that man could no longer adopt a non-committal attitude towards him. "He who is not with me is against me." "He who is not against us is on our side."[4]

We must not imagine that this demand for recognition and acceptance was a mere arbitrary or dogmatic claim on Jesus' part. He offered credentials. The nature and value of these credentials are of more interest to the author of the Fourth Gospel than to the Synoptists, though by no means ignored by these latter. His words of truth and love, his deeds of service, his whole pure and righteous life, testified to the nature of the Spirit by which he was actuated. Inasmuch as he not only expelled evil demons, but did everything else, by the Spirit of God, he knew his Divine authority would be recognized by all who were seeking to trace—with the help of the touchstone of conscience—the workings

[1] Mt xi. 16–19 ||.

[2] Mt xxii. 18 ||, etc. And compare the Agraphon quoted by Ropes in Hastings' *DB* v, 350 a: "I am weary of this generation; they proved me ten times, but these twenty and a hundred times."

[3] Mt xi. 6 ||.

[4] Mt xii. 30 ||; Mc ix. 40.

of the Divine in the lives of those around them. If therefore men rejected him, or were unimpressed by him, it showed that they were either thwarting or ignoring the testimony of God's Holy Spirit in their own hearts.[1]

3. The particular term that Jesus most often used to define that attitude of acceptance which he desired, was *faith*.[2] Faith in Jesus usually means in the Synoptic Gospels simply belief on the part of sufferers —or sometimes their friends—that Jesus is able to cure them. Faith in this sense was an indispensable condition of his working the cure. "Believe ye that I am able to do this?" "According to your faith may it be unto you!" "Thy faith has saved thee."[3] At Nazareth he could do no works of power, because of their unbelief.[4] But while this faith may with many have got no further than a simple belief in the reality of his healing power, for the more reflective patients it would involve some notion of the power in Jesus as a *Divine* power, the power of one in league with God. Thus we have the centurion taking it for granted that Jesus could—as the vice-gerent of God—send demons about their business by a simple word of command, just as he, the centurion, could order his men about because he represented to them the majesty and power

[1] Mc iii. 22–30 ||s.

[2] Readers not familiar with the original Greek of the New Testament may be reminded at this point that the English words 'faith' and 'belief,' and their derivatives and compounds, represent not two, but only one, root in the Greek. The distinction between the different-sounding English words, therefore, should be ignored.

[3] Mt ix. 22 ||s, 28 f, xv. 28; Mc v. 36, ix. 23, x. 52 ||s; Lc xvii. 19.

[4] Mc vi. 5 f ||.

of Herod Antipas himself.[1] And belief in Jesus as a divinely commissioned healer was not far removed from belief in him as a divinely commissioned friend and teacher and forgiver of sins. So Jesus declares to men: "The Kingdom of God has drawn near: repent and believe (or have faith in) the good news,"[2] i.e. in what I am preaching to you. So too, when the paralytic was let down before him, Jesus, "when he saw their *faith*, said to the paralytic: 'Child, thy sins are forgiven thee.'"[3] The story of the prostitute who anointed Jesus' feet is instructive in this respect. When Jesus said of her: "Her many sins have been forgiven, for she loved much," he did not mean, as we should naturally suppose, that she first loved, and then, as a consequence, was forgiven. Natural as that sense is when the words are taken by themselves, they are in view of the context impossible. The real meaning is: her many sins have been forgiven; and the proof of it lies in the great love she has shown. This is clear, not only from the words that immediately follow: "but he to whom little is forgiven, loves (only) a little," but also and chiefly from Jesus'

[1] Mt viii. 5–13 ||. This simple dialogue has been strangely misunderstood. Seeley (*Ecce Homo*, pref. to 5th edn) quite wrongly takes Jesus' words as spoken in approval of the centurion's *humility*, rather than of his *faith*. Even Dr. Moffatt misses the point by translating the centurion's words: "for *though* I am a man under authority myself, I have soldiers under me," etc (italics mine). There is nothing in the original to justify the word 'though,' and it obscures the meaning. The centurion had power over his men, because of, not in spite of, the fact that he was under authority himself: and he thought of Jesus not (as Seeley says) as "immeasurably above himself in that scale" of military rank in which he himself had a place, but as being, like himself, under the authority of a powerful superior, and therefore able to get his own orders carried out.

[2] Mc i. 15.

[3] Mc ii. 5 ||s.

parting words to the woman: "Thy *faith* has saved thee: go in peace." [1] It was not the woman's love that had saved her: it was her faith—her faith in Jesus, when he told her of the Divine Father's claim upon her and of His readiness to forgive and cleanse her, if she would but turn to Him. She did turn and was forgiven; and the experience brought her such joy that her gratitude overflowed in an act of love and homage. Here, we may note in passing, is a typical instance of Jesus having the religious value of God for men; probably the woman did not distinguish clearly in her own mind between the heavenly Father and the gentle human teacher, when she gave expression to her faith, her penitence, and her love.

When a modern Christian speaks about having faith in Jesus, clearly he does not refer to the miraculous power of Jesus as a healer—for that power is no longer perceptibly at work. Too often the only content given to the phrase is a vague feeling that Jesus has somehow or other secured Divine pardon for us. This has resulted from a too one-sided study of the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and the Romans, and has often led to a highly unethical conception of the Christian life. That faith should ever have come to be regarded as a conceivable alternative to—or substitute for—works, shows how lamentably the simple gospel of Jesus can get lost sight of, in the hurly-burly of religious controversy. Of faith, in the ultra-protestant sense of relying on the merits of Jesus to compensate for one's own failure or of believing that his sufferings have made adequate satisfaction for one's own demerits, the Gospels tell us nothing. Faith as

[1] Lc vii. 36–50.

Jesus uses the word means an acceptance of himself as the anointed messenger of God and a reliance on the truth of what he has to tell us of the Divine Love and the Divine Will.

4. The story of Jesus being anointed by the prostitute is one of the two places in the Gospels in which he speaks of being himself loved by some one. The other place is where he says: "He who loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me, and he who loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." [1] By a curious coincidence the similar story of his being anointed by Mary at Bethany is, with one exception, the only occasion on which he explicitly commends the treatment of himself with reverence. "She has done a good action to me . . . she has anticipated the embalmment of my body for burial." [2] The other occasion was when he defended those who cheered him on his triumphal entry into Jerusalem: "I tell you that if they are silent, the (very) stones will cry out." [3] The rarity of these allusions to the *love and reverence* he desired from men may be no more than an accident. All through his life—or at least all through his public ministry—Jesus was being ardently loved and deeply revered by those most attached to him. We cannot imagine that he ever disclaimed such tribute. At the same time it is curious that, in the Synoptic Gospels at least, Jesus so rarely asks anyone explicitly to love him or revere him. The reason surely was,

[1] Mt x. 37. [2] Mc xiv. 6, 8 ||: cf Jn xii. 7.
[3] Lc xix. 40. Mt (xxi. 15 f) represents the noisy offenders as children in the Temple, and Jesus' reply as: "Have ye never read, 'Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou perfected praise'?"

not that he did not desire such devotion, but that he knew that it would follow naturally as soon as men realized what he was able to do for them and be to them and as soon as they had faith to accept him and his gifts. Faith—or believing acceptance—was to come first, then repentance or conversion, then love and reverence.

5. What Jesus insisted on far more emphatically than professions of personal devotion and allegiance, was that people should *listen to him and listen intelligently*. How often does he punctuate his discourses with the half pathetic appeal: "Let him that hath ears to listen with, listen." [1] "Hearken," he says, as he begins a parable.[2] The familiar story of Martha and Mary [3] shows us, not that Jesus did not care for attention being paid by his friends to his bodily needs, but that he valued much more highly the attention that was paid to the truth he had to teach. Nor was he content that they should listen anyhow. He did not want his hearers to be like the rustic clown Shakespeare tells us of, who, when asked if he had not heard the royal proclamation, replied: "I do confess much of the hearing of it, but little of the marking of it." There were such hearers; and Jesus characterized them as seed sown by the wayside which the birds of the air devour [4]: or, as we should put it, the words went in at one ear and out at the other. Hence his repeated insistence on understanding. "Listen to me all of you, and understand," he says.[5] "Have ye understood all this?" he asked his disciples, after giving them a

[1] Mc iv. 9 ||s, 23 (vii. 16); Mt xi. 15, xiii. 43; Lc xiv. 35.
[2] Mc iv. 3: cf ix. 7 ||s; Lc x. 16.
[3] Lc x. 38–42. [4] Mc iv. 4, 15 ||s. [5] Mc vii. 14 ||.

good deal of teaching; and when they said they had, he continued: "Therefore every scribe who has been made a disciple to the Kingdom of Heaven is like a householder who produces from his store things new and old." [1] The scribe, we may remember, was a man who gave the whole of his time to the investigation of the meaning of Scripture. On one occasion we read that Jesus told a scribe that he was not far from the Kingdom of God, and that was when he "saw that he had answered intelligently." [2] Frequently did Jesus rebuke his disciples' lack of intelligence. "Know ye not this parable? How then will ye know all parables?" [3] "Are ye too so unintelligent? Do ye not understand. . .?" [4] "Do ye not yet understand or comprehend? Is your heart (still) hardened? Having eyes, see ye not? And having ears, do ye not hear; and do ye not remember?" [5] He refers men, not to the technical knowledge of experts, but to their ordinary human intelligence. He asks them simply to use their brains. "Whenever ye see a cloud rising in (the) west, at once ye say: 'A shower is coming', and so it happens. And whenever ye see (the) south wind blowing, ye say: 'It will be hot,' and so it happens. Hypocrites! ye know (how) to decipher the face of the earth and the sky: but how (is it) ye cannot decipher (the meaning of) this season? Why do ye not of yourselves judge what is righteous?" [6] "Become qualified bankers," he says, "rejecting some things, but clinging to what is good." [7]

[1] Mt xiii. 51 f.
[2] Mc xii. 34.
[3] Mc iv. 13.
[4] Mc vii. 18 ||.
[5] Mc viii. 17 ||, cf 21.
[6] Lc xii. 54–57.
[7] Ropes, in Hasting's *DB* v, p. 349 b.

This striking insistence of Jesus on the use of man's fullest intellectual powers in his religious life has not as a rule been adequately appreciated and understood. It has a bearing on the problem of the relation between knowledge and goodness on the one hand and between ignorance and sin on the other. That this relation is a very close one was clearly the teaching of the Old Testament and the belief of Jesus; and our own experience gives evidence to the same effect. Yet modern Christian theology—with its eye on the well-meaning fool who sins in ignorance and the clever rogue who is but the worse for his cleverness—tends to draw an absolute distinction between sin and ignorance and between knowledge and goodness. The cast-iron notions of sin and sinlessness that result from this divorce of the intellectual from the moral may ease the problem of morality on one side; but they complicate it on others. And in any case, as has been said, they are not true to our own experience. Not indeed that we are absolutely to identify knowledge and goodness or sin and ignorance: but can we possibly define the limits between them? Do we attach no moral worth to tact, sound judgment, the eager desire for truth, and ability to penetrate its mazes? Do we affix no moral stigma to stupidity or dull indifference to intellectual culture? Is not 'error' a name common to what is intellectually mistaken and to what is morally blameworthy? And do not New Testament writers continually represent the adoption of Christianity as the highest wisdom? [1]

[1] Oman rightly speaks of "this close partnership of sin with unreality" (*Grace and Personality*, p. 192, first edn).

The usual modern view-point, which divorces the intellectual from the moral elements in human personality because admittedly they cannot be quite identified, shows itself in a slightly modified form in the strong modern aversion to theology.[1] Not that this aversion is entirely at fault. In so far as it represents a revolt from that old-fashioned view that Christian truth consists entirely of certain cut-and-dried dogmas which are to be accepted unquestioningly, and (in olden times at least) enforced by persecution—while ethics have to be relegated en bloc to the province of the secular—this aversion from theology is a healthy sign of a return to reality. But unhappily it is not wholly that. It represents to a very large extent nothing more dignified than the natural disinclination of men to think for themselves. There are multitudes of people about, who are kind-hearted enough and in a sense well-intentioned, but who simply will not be bothered to think out anything. One of the incidental drawbacks to having a professional ministry is that it encourages people of this type in the churches to imagine that they need never use their own brains in religious matters, seeing that the parson is paid to do it for them. As Dr. A. J. Carlyle said a few years ago, the chief enemy to-day is not the unwillingness of Christian spirit, but " the unwillingness of Christian people to think out their own convictions with care and resolution, to ask themselves what it was exactly that those convictions meant, to distinguish better the merely traditional and the essential elements in Christianity." [2] That such tasks should be under-

[1] Moffatt, *The Theology of the Gospels*, pp. 1 ff.

[2] Speech at Recognition of Rev. R. Hobling, *Oxford Chronicle*,

taken by the Christian individual as such and not left to professional ministers is necessary on two grounds —firstly, for the good of the individual's own soul, for it is bad to be always imbibing even what is true without making any attempt to criticize, sift, classify, and apply it; and secondly, in order that a check may be kept on the theological and religious experts, and thus an unhealthy divorce between the theory and practice of religion (each of which is indispensable to the other) may be avoided.[1] The modern counterpart of Jesus' great summons: "Listen to me all of you, and understand," is the need to-day of a new theology, or rather a new philosophy of the Christian life, based—not on the outworn categories of older thinkers—but upon a fresh interpretation of the message and person of him who alone has been able to convince mankind that he can impart to them the truth and the guidance they need.

6. On several occasions Jesus said to certain individuals: "*Follow me*"; and each time he meant it in the literal sense. He said it to Simon and Andrew and to Jacob and John in their fishing-boats on the shore of the Sea of Galilee[2]; he said it to Matthew sitting at the receipt of custom[3]; he probably said

November 9, 1917. "Is the ordinary man anywhere a thoughtful creature? I think not" (a chaplain quoted in *The Army and Religion*, p. 106, cf p. 101).

[1] Mr. G. G. Coulton (in *Christ, St. Francis and To-day*, pp. 1 f) notes that, in the Middle Ages, "the specialist had little chance of appealing to the man in the street; and—more fatal still—the thoughts of the man in the street were not a constant atmosphere which the specialist was compelled to breathe whether he would or would not": he thinks that, in the modern world, as in ancient Greece, the crowd and the specialist do "come into frank and natural contact." Such contact, of course, there is; but there is room for more of it.

[2] Mc i. 16–20 ||.

[3] Mc ii. 14 ||s.

it—though we are not actually told so—to each of the Twelve, as and when he first called them;[1] he said it to the man who wanted to go and bury his father[2]: he said it finally to the rich young ruler whom he bade sell all that he had and give the proceeds to the poor.[3] We might fairly argue that all these were cases where Jesus wanted the personal company of certain men for special reasons in order that they might do some special work in connection with his Palestinian mission. But there are two other passages in the Synoptic tradition, perhaps doublets of one another—in which Jesus demands this act of following from *all* his disciples. One of them reads: "If anyone wishes to come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me."[4] The other reads: "Whoever does not take his cross and follow after me, is not worthy of me."[5] There can be little doubt that literal following and the literal acceptance of crucifixion are here referred to: for Luke's addition of the word 'daily' in the former passage is an obvious accommodation to the everyday needs of his Christian readers. We can only conclude that there was a period in Jesus' ministry when he really desired all his sincere adherents to join him in a common act of sacrifice as the victims of Jewish hostility and as the martyrs, champions, and heralds of the Kingdom.[6] If so, the average modern Christian is not

[1] Mc iii. 13 f ||s: cf Mt xix. 28.

[2] Mt viii. 22 ||. [3] Mc x. 21 ||s.

[4] Mc viii. 34; Mt xvi. 24; Lc ix. 23. Lc adds 'daily' after 'his cross.'

[5] Mt x. 38; Lc xiv. 27 ('cannot be my disciple').

[6] This would help to explain Jesus' prophecy to Jacob and John that they should drink his cup and be baptized with his baptism (Mc x. 39 ||).

called on to 'follow' Jesus in the sense in which he used the word. It is under other aspects of discipleship, as Jesus unfolded it, that he will recognize his obligations to his Master.

7. Of those other aspects, unquestionably the clearest and most comprehensive is that of *obedience*.[1] Jesus called for an absolute and complete obedience to his teaching. He did not philosophize about the grounds of his obedience: but we can detect without much difficulty what those grounds were. This submission of men to himself was not meant to quench the use of their own independent moral judgment: on the contrary, as we have seen, Jesus expected men to think out for themselves the meaning of what he said: he himself did not provide them with a complete code covering all the minutiæ of the moral life. Nor was their obedience to be like that of the subjects of a despotic ruler, who have to bow to his authority as an established fact, and who must either obey or else forthwith cease to exist.[2] It is true that Jesus represented the ultimate fruit of disobedience to himself as utter ruin[3]; but that was left to the indefinite future, and in the meantime no one was to be coerced into obeying against his will. Jesus called on men to obey him simply on the ground that what he commanded was right and good and represented God's Will. It was for that reason that he taught that ultimate security—or salvation—depended on obedience, and that ultimate perdition would eventually follow upon disobedience. It was for that reason too, that he could represent

[1] Mt vii. 24–27 ||; Lc vi. 46: cf Mc iv. 3, 8, 14, 20 ||s.
[2] Mc x. 42–45 ||s.
[3] Mt vii. 24–27 ||; cf xi. 20–24 ||.

his own behests with equal suitability either as commands or as invitations. Besides issuing exacting orders and calling for unstinted sacrifices, he invited the toiling and burdened to come to him, to assume his gracious yoke and shoulder his light burden, and so to find true rest for themselves.[1] Notice here the strange paradox of the weary finding rest through submission to a yoke and the assumption of a burden. Such a paradox is rendered possible only when the task and its reward coalesce, because each is identified with the Will of God. "Happy (are) they," says Jesus, "who hear the word of God, and keep (it)."[2]

The question as to the form and range of the response due from the modern Christian to this demand of Jesus for obedience is the question with which the whole of this book is attempting to deal. We are endeavouring, under each successive heading, to extract the eternally valid elements from the record in which they are enshrined—to discover what the teaching of Jesus means when put in terms of modern thought and responsibility. But the very effort to do this in detail presupposes—not only our right to use our own critical faculties—but other and still more fundamental postulates, viz: our belief that guidance for modern life is obtainable from this source and our obligation to obey that guidance when we have discovered it. These are postulates which few Christians would be found to deny in so many words; but the virtual denial of them, or something very like it, seems certainly to be involved in the position taken up by some leaders of religious thought to-day, who, on this plea or that, relegated the commands of Jesus to a position of virtual irre-

[1] Mt xi. 28–30. [2] Lc xi. 28.

levance, so far as modern life is concerned. Either Jesus was too eschatological to be a safe guide for us nowadays; or obedience to his recorded teaching savours of legalism or literalism; or else the teaching applies only to a perfect state of society, or only to purely private and personal matters; and so on. Something has already been said in the Introduction on this general topic, and something more will have to be said later on in regard to some of its special bearings [1]; the point that has to be noted here is the immense stress which Jesus himself laid on the need for practical and complete obedience. We may readily grant that times have changed, that Jesus would say some things very differently if he were living in our midst to-day, that we must accordingly hold ourselves free to criticize and adapt, that the Person of Jesus is more important than his words, that the Risen and Indwelling Christ overrides all merely historical records, and so on and so on; yet, notwithstanding every such qualification, it is clear that we shall be reducing most of our customary devotional language to a mockery, we shall be setting an unreal gulf between the Cross and him who died on it, we shall even be forfeiting our right to speak of an indwelling *Christ* at all, if we are ignoring a responsibility on which Christ himself laid such constant and tremendous emphasis.

8. Nothing is clearer than that Jesus looked for *reliable, industrious, and efficient service.* The attitude of Browning's Rabbi ben Ezra, who laid most stress on motive and aspiration and not very much

[1] The present writer has attempted a rather fuller treatment of the question in a paper that appeared in *The Expositor*, for February, 1920, on 'The Place of Jesus' Ethical Teaching in Modern Christian Life.'

on achievement, is not that of Jesus. Jesus indeed was far from being unconscious of the importance of motive, as we may see from his Sermon on the Mount,[1] from his statement that the servant who knew not his Master's will, and consequently did things worthy of stripes, would be beaten with only a few stripes,[2] and from the parable in which the labourers who had stood idle a long time, because no man had hired them, were paid a full day's wage.[3] But he did lay stress on results. "They who were sown on the good ground are those who hear the word, and receive it, and bear fruit, thirty- and sixty- and a hundred-fold."[4] In his parable of the Pounds or Talents, as Luke gives it, the servant who had traded so well with his one pound as to convert it into ten, was rewarded with the rule of ten cities, and similarly he who had produced five was rewarded with the rule of five cities.[5] In Matthew's version—probably the more original—the two good servants simply double the deposit entrusted to them of five and two talents respectively, and both alike are rewarded by being invited to enter the joy of their Master[6]: whereas the third servant, who in both versions alike does nothing but keep his money has to hand it over to the first servant, and is then expelled in disgrace.[7] There was a third version of this parable—possibly the most original of all—found in the lost Gospel according to the Hebrews: in this, only the first servant traded and gained profit; the second hid his money; while the third wasted it in bad company: the first was rewarded,

[1] E.g. Mt v. 21 f, 27 f. [2] Lc xii. 47 f. [3] Mt xx. 1–15.
[4] Mc iv. 20 ||s. [5] Lc xix. 13–19. [6] Mt xxv. 14–23.
[7] Mt xxv. 24–30: cf Lc xix. 20–26.

the second censured, and the third imprisoned.[1] All which goes to show that Jesus laid very considerable stress on the practical efficiency of men's service, and sometimes at least took an almost commercially quantitative view of its value.

So much for efficiency: not for extent. We have spoken of 'servants'; we ought rather to have used the word 'slaves.' Without departing at all from what he had said about his own mission to serve men and to give rest to their souls and about God's tender love for them, Jesus yet chooses the most rigorous form of human service he knows, viz: slavery, as a fitting illustration of what men owe to himself and to God. We must remember that according to ancient law, "the slave could do no more than his duty; the master had a right to exact all that he could do in his interest, without any need for gratitude."[2] And so Jesus says: "Who (is there) among you, that has a slave ploughing or tending sheep, who will say to him when he has come in from the field, 'Come at once and recline (at table),' and will not (rather) say to him, 'Get something ready for me to have supper, and gird thyself, and wait on me, while I eat and drink, and after that thou shalt eat and drink?' Does he thank the slave because he did what was commanded? (Of course not.) Even so, ye also, when ye have done all the things that are commanded you, say, 'We are (simply) slaves: we have (merely) done what we ought to have done.'[3]" So absolute and unlimited is the service Jesus demands of us.

[1] See Ropes, in Hastings' *DB* v, p. 345 b.

[2] C. Schmidt, *The Social Results of Early Christianity* (ET), p. 348.

[3] Lc xvii. 7–10. See above, p. 72 n 1.

And this is his gracious yoke and his easy burden!

Besides efficiency and unlimitedness, Jesus requires that our service shall be faithful. His precepts on this point nearly all have reference to a particular eschatological thought—different, be it remarked, from that noticed above, according to which Jesus asks all his followers to join his ranks and be crucified with him—the thought, namely, of his own temporary absence, the interval between death and (resurrection or) return, the vague indefinite 'three days,' during which his followers are faithfully to go about their duties, being always ready for his return, like the servants of a master absent on a journey or the maidens waiting to meet a bridegroom. "Happy are those servants whom the Master when he comes will find watching."[1] The particular eschatological context in which the numerous sayings of this type are set, is no longer part of our Christian outlook: but the religious value of the warning remains, seeing that for us the uncertainty of the time of our own death corresponds very closely to what was for the early Christian the uncertainty of the time of his Lord's coming.

9. Finally, Jesus required his followers to *be prepared to suffer hardship and persecution*, even to the point of scourging and death, if need be, for his sake. He warned one who offered to follow him that the Son of Man had nowhere to lay his head.[2] He forewarned his disciples repeatedly that severe persecution was bound to come.[3] They were to

[1] See above, p. 68 n 2, and cf Mc xiii. 33–37; Mt xxiv. 42–xxv. 30; Lc xii. 35–48, xiii. 23 ff, xxi. 34–36.

[2] Mt viii. 20 ||.

[3] Mt v. 10–12 ||, x. 16–39 ||s, xvi. 24–27 ||s, xxiv. 9–13 ||s; Mc iv. 5 f, 16 f ||s, ix. 49, x. 38 f ||s; Lc xiv. 28–33.

be prudent as serpents, harmless as doves, but above all, fearless and faithful.[1] The great thing they were to avoid in time of persecution was being betrayed into denying their Master.[2] He who held out bravely to the end, would be saved.[3] And if life itself must be sacrificed in case of need, so too must all life's joys—including the ties of property and family life. But every loss thus incurred would be amply compensated.[4] Once more, let us notice how, despite the immense differences between his outlook on the pagan world and our own, the essence of these demands of his still remains valid for us. We can make our own that Lucan adaptation of his saying: "If any man would come after me, let him take up his cross *daily* and follow me."[5] Every Christian has his daily cross of hardship to bear for Jesus; but for each of us there always remains at least the risk, whether near or remote, that the larger and more tragic sacrifice of liberty, property, and life itself, may, through some special combination of circumstances, be demanded of us, for the sake of Jesus and the Kingdom.

10. No treatment of the subject of our duty to Jesus would be complete without some notice of what may be called the doctrine of *mystical union with Christ*, of Christ dwelling in us, of our dwelling in Christ, and so forth. These phrases, it is true, do not find much basis in the Synoptic Gospels. We do find there that Jesus promises to be in the midst of any two or three disciples gathered together

[1] Mt x. 16, 26, 28–31 ||.
[2] Mt x. 32 f ||s: cf Mc xiv. 27, 30 f ||s.
[3] Mt x. 22, xxiv. 13 ||s.
[4] Mt x. 21, 34–37 ||s; Mc x. 29–31 ||s.
[5] See above, p. 108 n. 4.

in his name. We find him identifying himself with his disciples—so that he who rejects or receives them rejects or receives him—also with those whom he calls the least of his brethren.[1] But it is not until we come to the Epistles of Paul that we find the idea of the Christ as a Living Presence within his disciple strongly and clearly expressed.[2] In the Fourth Gospel, it becomes so prominent and so highly developed that it is made to replace the whole earlier Synoptic teaching about the 'return' of the Son of Man. In later times there have been many Christians whose inner experience has driven them to speak of personal and living association with Jesus as the lover of their souls. There are also, however, multitudes of Christians who have never had any experience of their own which forces them to the use of this mystical language; and to them the use of that language by others, and still more the attempt to represent the experience that prompts it as necessary or even normal for a true Christian, causes difficulty.[3] We are not to imagine that, because Paul—or the author of the Fourth Gospel—felt that way, the majority of their fellow-Christians necessarily did the same. But it is not our task to enlarge here on this delicate and sacred theme. Each man must be left to make what he can of the privileges given to him. It is worth remembering that those who

[1] See the passages quoted above, p. 56.

[2] "His personal religion was, in essence, a pure mysticism; he worships a Christ whom he has experienced as a living presence in his soul" (Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, p. 213). "We have also, fully developed, the mystical doctrine of the Spirit of Christ immanent in the soul of the believer, a conception which was the core of St. Paul's personal religion" (*ibid.* p. 224).

[3] Cf Dean Inge's rough characterization of the two types of mind, in *Outspoken Essays*, p. 161.

have most definite experience of the presence of Christ tell us that they do not distinguish between that and the presence of God. Thus both Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel seem to identify the Risen Christ with the Holy Spirit[1]: modern Christian mystics make the same confession. We might not unworthily compare Tennyson's consciousness of the omipresence of his departed friend:

> Thy voice is on the rolling air;
> I hear thee where the waters run;
> Thou standest in the rising sun,
> And in the setting thou art fair.
>
> What art thou then? I cannot guess;
> But tho' I seem in star and flower
> To feel thee some diffusive power,
> I do not therefore love thee less:
>
> My love involves the love before;
> My love is vaster passion now;
> Tho' mixed with God and Nature thou,
> I seem to love thee more and more.
>
> Far off thou art, but ever nigh;
> I have thee still, and I rejoice;
> I prosper, circled with thy voice;
> I shall not lose thee tho' I die.[2]

It must also be borne in mind that any modern Christian who has 'faith in Jesus' must believe that Jesus is still living, for personal immortality was one of his most fundamental convictions; and as he is now untrammelled by the limitations of his flesh, it would seem to follow that he can be in personal touch with each one of us. And if he is still

[1] 2 Cor iii. 17, Rom viii. 9–11 (see Denney's note on verse 11 in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*); 1 Cor iii. 16; Gal ii. 20; Jn xiv. 3, 18, 21, 23, 28, xvi. 16, compared with xiv. 16 f, 26 f, xv. 26, xvi. 7, 13, etc.

[2] *In Memoriam*, cxxx.

the gracious Saviour he was, he will be willing to keep company with any that seek and need him, however closely their eyes may be holden so that they cannot discern him. The prime qualification is the moral one of personal surrender and practical obedience. "If any man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." [1]

[1] Jn xiv. 23.

E. *OUR DUTY TO OTHERS GENERALLY*

1. "THE first (commandment) is, '. . . Thou shalt love the Lord thy God. . . .' The second is like it, '*Thou shalt love thy neighbour as (thou lovest) thyself.*' There is no other commandment greater than these: on these two commandments hangs the whole Law and the Prophets." [1] In these words Jesus puts in a nutshell the whole duty of man. The whole of Christian ethics consists in the elucidation of these tremendous maxims.

The first point which it is important for us to notice is the universal scope that Jesus gave to the words enjoining the love of our neighbour. The word 'neighbour' was one either of limited or else ambiguous meaning. It seems to have been at first roughly equivalent to 'brother'; and 'brother' meant 'fellow-Jew'—to the exclusion of the Gentile. In later times 'neighbour' was appropriated to proselytes, while 'brother' was reserved for fellow-Jews in the strict sense.[2] The doubt that hung about the exact meaning of 'neighbour' is revealed in the sequel added by certain Rabbis to the old commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour, *and hate thine enemy,*" and in the question once

[1] Mc xii. 29–31; Mt xxii. 37–40 (cf xix. 17–19||s); Lc x. 27 f.

[2] Acts vii. 2, xxiii. 1, xxviii. 17, 21; Rom ix. 3 f, etc; Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*, on Mt v. 22; Farrar, in Smith's *DB* i, p. 230; Streane's note on Lev xix. 18 in *Cambridge Bible*.

addressed to Jesus in connection with the same commandment: "Who is my neighbour?" Jesus put his own meaning beyond all question when he definitely enjoined love for *enemies*,[1] and when he answered the question, "Who is my neighbour?" by telling the parable of the Good *Samaritan*.[2] For Jesus then the word 'neighbour' is synonymous with 'fellow-man.' Gladstone was truly interpreting this great Christian law when he said: "Remember that the sanctity of life in the hill villages of Afghanistan, among the winter snows, is as inviolable in the eye of Almighty God as can be your own. Remember that He who has united you as human beings in the same flesh and blood, has bound you by the law of mutual love; that that mutual love is not limited by the shores of this island, is not limited by the boundaries of Christian civilization; that it passes over the whole surface of the earth, and embraces the meanest along with the greatest in its unmeasured scope." [3]

2. But now, *what is love?* "Love," says Dr. Oman, "is not kindly emotion, but moral esteem." [4] Love is defined by someone else as "the redeeming identification of oneself with another," "no flickering or wayward emotion, but the energy of a steadfast will bent on creating fellowship." [5] Some of these modern definitions may be true enough, but they are not sufficiently simple for the ordinary man. Jesus himself gives a perfectly simple explanation of what

[1] Mt v. 43 ff ||. [2] Lc x. 25–37.

[3] Morley, *Gladstone*, ii, pp. 451 f. Cf Augustine, *De Disc. Christ.* iii (Proximus est omni homini omnis homo).

[4] *Grace and Personality*, p. 261.

[5] Two writers quoted by R. Roberts, in *Hibbert Journal*, July 1919, p. 671.

he understands by love. "All things whatsoever ye wish that men should do to you, so do ye also to them: for this is the Law and the Prophets." [1] The summary character of this precept—together with the reference to the Law and the Prophets—warrants us in regarding the rule as an equivalent of that which bids us love our neighbour as ourself. It tells us therefore what Jesus means by love: he means doing to others—not necessarily what they want you to do—but what you yourself would like them to do to you if you, *with your present views and wishes as a Christian disciple*,[2] were in their position. And the 'doing,' let us remember, covers speaking to and about men and thinking about them as well as acting towards them. Love, then, is no mere involuntary or spontaneous emotion: it is to be felt and practised as a matter of duty and therefore as a consequence of effort. It is made the subject of a direct imperative. Just as we like to be treated, not exactly according to what we are, but according to what we are hoping and trying to be,[3] so does the law of Christian love bid us treat our neighbour. "The ethical meaning of love is to treat every man as an end in himself, reverencing him, not for what he is, but for what he ought to become." [4]

> You must love him, ere to you
> He will seem worthy of your love.

---

[1] Mt vii. 12 ||.

[2] This qualification is clearly necessary, as without it the Golden Rule would amount simply to doing what others want, e.g. giving the toper his liquor, and so on.

[3] Augustine, *De Trinitate*, i. 10: Tales nos amat Deus, quales futuri sumus, non quales sumus.

[4] Oman, *op cit*, p. 284. Cf Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, pp. 60 f.

3. But, even when elucidated in this way by the Golden Rule, the content of the command to love our neighbour as ourself is not quite as clear as we need it to be. For some of us are in need of guidance as to what we ought to wish men to do to us. Jesus, therefore, goes a good way beyond these two simple and bare precepts, and explains in some little detail how they should work out in actual life. He tells us in the first place of the main principles that should guide us in our relations with men generally: then he adds instructions as to how we should treat wrong-doers of various kinds: then he speaks on such special aspects as the relations of the sexes, the obligations of family life, the use of property, and the relation to the State. Let us proceed to examine his teaching on these several points.

As regards our relationships with our fellow-men in general, the great root-principle of *love branches out into four important but derived principles:* mercy, wisdom, truthfulness, and humility.

4. Firstly, *Mercy*, or, as we should call it, *kindness*. "Happy (are) the merciful," says Jesus, "for they will receive mercy." [1] "Go and learn what this means, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice.'" [2] He reckoned 'mercy' among the weightier matters of the Law.[3] He told his immortal parable of the Good Samaritan who showed mercy on a foreigner, as a good instance of what he meant by neighbourly love.[4] "Come, ye blessed of my Father; inherit the Kingdom prepared for you (ever) since (the) foundation of (the) world. For I was hungry, and ye gave me (food) to eat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me (something)

[1] Mt v. 7.
[2] Mt ix. 13; cf xii. 7.
[3] Mt xxiii. 23.
[4] Lc x. 25–37.

to drink; I was a stranger, and ye entertained me; (I was) naked, and ye clothed me; I was ill, and ye looked after me; I was in prison, and ye came to (see) me. . . . Inasmuch as ye did (it) to one of the least of these brothers of mine, ye did (it) to me." [1] We need not suppose that mercy is to such an extent a synonym for almsgiving that it has no place in the general relationships of ordinary people, who are economically independent of one another. Anyone with whom we have any dealings is a fit and proper subject for kind treatment, i.e. for mercy. Furthermore it is fairly obvious that sweating, underpayment, killing, wounding, asphyxiating and drowning in war, and starving by means of a hunger-blockade, or by an iniquitous and vengeful Peace-Treaty, are not acts of mercy.

5. Secondly, *Wisdom*. It will be remembered that Jesus pressingly demanded from men the exercise of common-sense, thought, understanding, and intelligence, in the reception they gave to his spoken message.[2] He was equally insistent on the use of the same qualities in men's dealings with one another. He bade his disciples, as they went out into the world, "become prudent like the snakes." [3] He included folly among the evil things that come from within and defile the man.[4] Even the dishonest steward in the parable is, despite his dishonesty, praised for his shrewdness: "for the sons of this age are more prudent than the sons of the light in (dealing with) their generation." [5] Another of his parables depicts the faithful and prudent servant,

[1] Mt xxv. 34–40: cf x. 7 f, 40–42, xii. 11 f, xxvi. 11 ||s; Mc ix. 37 ||s.
[2] See above, pp. 103–107.
[3] Mt x. 16.
[4] Mc vii. 21–23 ||.
[5] Lc xvi. 8.

whom the Master puts over his household to distribute rations to his fellow-servants at the proper time.[1] All this is a commendation of the wise handling of our fellows, of skill and tact and penetration in dealing with them, and a condemnation of all clumsiness and stupidity, all causing of others to stumble.[2] Jesus would not have regarded the wisdom he asked for as a mere intellectual or non-moral knowledge of facts : it must be a wisdom born of love ; it must rest on a basis of sympathy, charity, and reverence for others. Mere knowledge, as Tennyson says,

> . . . is earthly of the mind,
> But Wisdom heavenly of the soul.
> O, friend, who camest to thy goal
> So early, leaving me behind,
>
> I would the great world grew like thee,
> Who grewest not alone in power
> And knowledge, but by year and hour
> In reverence and in charity.[3]

6. Thirdly, *Truthfulness*. Jesus forbade his followers to take oaths, on the ground that their word ought to be as good as their bond. "Let your speech be 'yes, yes,' 'no, no' : whatever goes beyond these comes from the evil one." [4] "Thou shalt not bear false-witness." [5] False-witness and deceit are among the evil things that come from within and defile the man.[6] Hence his unsparing condemnation of all dishonest pretence in the religion of his day.[7] Coming generations of Christians will read with a smile the thousand clever explanations by which scholars

[1] Mt xxiv. 45 f ||.
[2] Mt xviii. 6 f ||s, xxiii. 13, 15.
[3] *In Memoriam*, cxiv.
[4] Mt v. 33–37 : cf Lc xvi. 10–12.
[5] Mc x. 19 ||s.
[6] Mc vii. 21–23 ||.
[7] E.g. Mc xii. 40 || ; Mt vi. 1–6, 16–18, xxiii. 23–28 ||.

and preachers of our own and earlier times have proved that, when Jesus forbade oaths, of course he did not mean what he said, or that, even if he did, of course his disciples to-day need not be bound by what he said.[1] But that is not the worst that has to be said. Not only has Jesus failed to convince his disciples that they ought not to swear, but he has not even convinced them that they ought always to tell the truth. Many Christian people fail to see any real difference between concealing a private fact (which every person is perfectly entitled to do if he wishes) and deliberately uttering a false statement with the intention of deceiving (which no Christian ought to do). And what makes this obtuseness stranger still is the delightfully inconsistent way in which Christian judgments on untruthfulness are passed. Thus the ardent Protestant will anathematize the Jesuit who avows that he is ready to tell a lie in the service of the Holy Church: and he condemns such falsehood as an application of "that vile principle which has given birth to the most destructive deeds recorded in history—that the end sanctifies the means."[2] On the same ground a modern writer condemns Bolshevism: "Lenin is therefore opposed to violence; but in order to achieve Communism he admits that violence is necessary. He here commits himself to the notorious doctrine that the end justifies the means."[3] And yet it is hard to find a Protestant who believes that it is never

[1] E.g. Rev. G. W. Stewart in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, ii, pp. 255 f.

[2] Neander, *Life of Jesus Christ* (ET), p. 423. (He is not, however, speaking of that particular *use* of the principle which we are discussing).

[3] *Times Literary Supplement*, January 15, 1920, p. 26.

right to tell a lie in any circumstances, or an anti-Bolshevist who does not believe that sometimes a good end, like security, justifies the use of a bad means, like violence and war. As a matter of fact, the critic in these cases does not really believe that bad means, like lies and war, are always wrong; he does not believe that the end never justifies the means: he condemns the Jesuit and the Bolshevist, not really for believing that the end justifies the means, but for trying to achieve an 'end' with which he (the critic) is profoundly out of sympathy. Cardinal Newman aptly pointed out in his *Apologia* that Jeremy Taylor, John Milton, William Paley, and Samuel Johnson all believed that a lie was permissible under certain conditions; and he reasonably protested against Catholics being condemned for fostering the habit of falsehood, because they believed that a lie in the service of what was to them the right cause was permissible.[1] But when brought to the test of the Golden Rule, how fares this habit of occasional and tactful lying? No sensible Christian man ever wants to be told a lie. He may, under certain circumstances, like to have the truth concealed from him, but that is another matter. An eminent scientist once wrote to W. T. Stead: "A doctor rarely if ever tells the truth to his patient or the patient's friends. He is quite right not to, as his treatment and general attitude to the patient requires that he should keep all doubt to himself. And further, a patient or his friends are *incapable* of repeating

[1] Newman, *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, Pt. vii end (pp. 242–249 in 'Everyman'). Cf Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers* ii, pp. 335, 611, 627 for the views of Jerome, Augustine, and Chrysostom on the point.

correctly what a doctor has said about the case." [1] But if this is the doctor's avowed practice, who is going to be foolish enough to believe him, or even to waste time asking him questions? A doctor once told me a lie in an illness, thinking it needful to do so in order to save my life: but I can never bring myself to believe that it was really necessary or that there was no better alternative or to be glad that he did so: nor indeed should I ever feel quite satisfied in taking his word again. No Christian ever wants to be told a lie, and therefore he must never tell one. If I know a man believes that lying is sometimes right, then my confidence in him is seriously shaken, and I shall never be quite sure he is not deceiving me. And conversely, what a different world it would be if truthfulness was universal! As J. S. Mill said: "The advantage to mankind of being able to trust one another, penetrates into every crevice and cranny of human life." [2]

7. *Humility.* Jesus described himself as 'humble in heart,' [3] and commended as happy those that were 'poor in spirit.' [4] Arrogance, like folly and untruthfulness, was among the defiling thoughts that come from within.[5] He condemned the prostitution of religious acts like almsgiving, prayer, and fasting, to a mere desire for human praise,[6]—the thrusting of oneself forward into the chief place.[7] "Whoever uplifts himself will be humbled, and whoever humbles

[1] *Review of Reviews*, January 1891, p. 50.
[2] *Principles of Political Economy*, I, vii, 5.
[3] Mt xi. 29. [4] Mt v. 3.
[5] Mc vii. 21–23 (the parallel in Mt xv. 19 omits it).
[6] Mt vi. 1–6, 16–18. [7] Mt xxiii. 5–10 ||s.

himself will be uplifted." [1] "If anyone wishes to be first, he shall be last of all and servant of all." [2] "Whoever . . . humbles himself like this little child, he is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven." [3] "Ye know that those who are reckoned to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great (men) exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you. But whoever wishes to become great among you, shall be your servant, and whoever wishes to become first among you, shall be (the) slave of all. For the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life (as) a ransom for many." [4]

Christian humility does not mean certain things it is sometimes taken to mean. It does not mean shutting one's eyes to facts: Jesus said we were to judge one another by our fruits; and the fault of the Pharisee who prayed in the Temple was not that he thanked God that he was not like the tax-collector, but that he was not aware of his own need of pardon.[5]

[1] Mt xxiii. 12 ||s. [2] Mc ix. 35 ||s.
[3] Mt xviii. 4. [4] Mc x. 42–45 ||s.
[5] It is worth while recalling O. W. Holmes' sensible apologia for this Pharisee in *The Poet at the Breakfast-Table* (near the end): "'The parable was told to illustrate a single virtue, humility, and the most unwarranted inferences have been drawn from it as to the whole character of the two parties. It seems not at all unlikely, but rather probable, that the Pharisee was a fairer dealer, a better husband, and a more charitable person than the Publican, whose name has come down to us "linked with one virtue," but who may have been guilty, for aught that appears to the contrary, of "a thousand crimes." Remember how we limit the application of other parables. The lord, it will be recollected, commended the unjust steward because he had done *wisely*. His shrewdness was held up as an example, but after all he was a miserable swindler, and deserved the State-prison as much as many of our financial operators. The parable of the Pharisee and the Publican is a perpetual warning against spiritual pride.

Nor does humility mean abdicating the right of private judgment—as the Catholic so often implies when he accuses the Protestant of 'pride.' Nor does it even mean having no desire for fame: for fame may be desired, not simply for the pleasure of notoriety, but for the sake of the cause it represents. "The thirst for an enduring fame," said Gladstone, "is near akin to the love of true excellence."[1] Nor again does humility involve the absence of all wish to influence or control others: not only did Jesus himself desire such influence, but he promised the possession of it to his followers.[2] No: humility means subordinating the desire for praise and for fame to the prime interests of the Kingdom of God: it excludes the eager pushing of oneself before others instead of waiting for the logic of events to assign one one's true place[3]: it means—as Jesus' reference to the Gentile rulers proves—the refusal to coerce others into compliance with one's wishes[4]: it means, above all, the ready and lowly service of our fellows.

But it must not frighten any one of us out of being thankful that he is not, like this or that neighbour, under bondage to strong drink or opium, that he is not an Erie Railroad Manager, and that his head rests in virtuous calm on his own pillow. If he prays in the morning to be kept out of temptation as well as for his daily bread, shall he not return thanks at night that he has not fallen into sin as well as that his stomach has been filled? I do not think the poor Pharisee has ever had fair play, and I am afraid a good many people sin with the comforting, half-latent intention of smiting their breasts afterwards and repeating the prayer of the Publican.'—(*Sensation*)."

[1] Morley, *Gladstone*, i, p. 473.

[2] See below, pp. 171 f.

[3] Lc xiv. 7–11.

[4] See below, p. 158.

F. *OUR DUTY IN DOMESTIC AND FINANCIAL MATTERS*

1. JESUS took over much of the current teaching of his time in regard to *the relations of the sexes.* He condemned adultery and other forms of sexual vice, going so far as to forbid even the lustful gaze at a married woman as virtually equivalent to adultery.[1] But in two respects he made a very special contribution of his own to the whole question.

2. In the first place, he laid immense stress on *the inherent sanctity of family ties.* He describes husband and wife as those whom God has joined together: their union is therefore indissoluble—"what God has joined together, let not man separate."[2] Jesus absolutely forbids remarriage after divorce as adulterous.[3] The exception to this ruling, based on the wife's unfaithfulness, is found only in Mt,[4] and is no doubt the evangelist's accommodation to the hardness to certain early Christian hearts, just as Moses' permission of divorce was an accommodation to the hardness of the Israelites' hearts. Jesus condemns as adulterous a marriage with the divorced wife of another man, or a marriage with any woman when the man's own divorced wife is still living.[5] The law of this country is still accom-

[1] Mc iv. 7, 18 f ||s, vii. 21–23 ||, x. 19 ||s; Mt v. 27 f; Jn viii. 11.
[2] Mc x. 5–9 ||.
[3] Mc x. 11 f; Lc xvi. 18.
[4] Mt v. 31 f, xix. 9.
[5] See note 3.

modated to the hardness of men's hearts, instead of embodying the full Divine purpose.[1] But there is much more about the sanctity of family life in Jesus' teaching than just this prohibition of divorce. Let us ask ourselves what view of human parenthood must have been his who quoted the command "Honour thy father and thy mother" as the command of God,[2] and who chose the word Father as his favourite name for God? What light does Jesus' tender fondness for little children[3] throw on his view of marriage and family life? And what is involved in his use of the term 'brother' to express the sacred fellowship of his own disciples with himself and with one another?[4] "The family is, to the mind of Jesus, the nearest of human analogies to that Divine order which it was his mission to reveal."[5]

3. But, secondly, Jesus knew that, in the tangled complexity of human affairs, situations often arise which involve a conflict even of the most sacred loyalties, and that, in such cases,

Good counsels must perforce give place to better.

If and when family obligations come into conflict with our duty as members of the Kingdom of God, *the family obligations have got to be sacrificed.* Adherence to Jesus would be bound to split families—very well then, they must be split.[6] "He who loves

[1] See below, p. 169 n 1. [2] Mc vii. 9–13, x. 19 ||s.
[3] Mc ix. 36 f, x. 13–16 ||s: cf. Mt xxi. 15.
[4] See above pp. 47 and 119, and cf Mt xxiii. 8, Mc v. 19 ||, Lc xvi. 27–31.
[5] F. G. Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, ch. iii.
[6] Mt x. 21, 34–36 ||s; Mc x. 29–30 ||s.

father or mother more than me is not worthy of me, and he who loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." [1] The clearest instances of this conflict to-day occur in the mission-field, where conversion to Christianity often involves a complete breach of fellowship in family life. In Western society, the case is not so acute; but instances in which a man's loyalty to some ideal means displeasure and offence on the part of his home-circle are not infrequent. A generation, like our own, that has shewn itself capable of sacrificing sons, husbands, lovers, brothers, and fathers, at the call of patriotism, should have no difficulty in admitting the possibility of claims superior to that of the family, and in seeing that the recognition of these claims is not necessarily inconsistent with the payment of due honour to that to which they are superior.[2]

4. Jesus plainly stated that the demands of the Kingdom of God might involve for some a life of *celibacy*. "There are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the Kingdom of Heaven. Let him who is able to receive (it), receive (it)." [3] The pre-occupations of married life had tended to make people insensible of approaching judgment in the days of Noah and Lot, and would do so again in the days of the Son of Man.[4] Jesus

[1] Mt x. 37: cf viii. 21 f ||, xxiii. 9, and Lc xiv. 26.

[2] "The saying of Jesus sounds harsh," says O. Holtzmann (*Life of Jesus*, ET, pp. 304 f) with reference to Mt viii. 21 f ||: "But they have a narrow acquaintance with life who think that there can be no cause sufficient to prevent a man from taking part in the burial of his own father."

[3] Mt xix. 12.

[4] Lc xvii. 26–30 ||: cf xiv. 20. No marriage in the resurrection fe, Mc xii. 25 ||s.

does not exalt celibacy as an ideal state for men generally, or even for his own disciples. To do so would have been to contradict his own words as to the Divine origin and sanction of marriage.[1] But he does realize that, under the conditions then existing, marriage might become for some a hindrance to loyal discipleship and zealous service in the Kingdom: and he believed it to be a man's duty, if such was the case, to forego it.

5. Jesus did not condemn private *property* as such. "Your heavenly Father knows that ye have need of all these things."[2] Simon Peter kept his house and his belongings after his call.[3] Jesus himself did so up to the time of his baptism, and possibly later.[4] Joanna and other women possessed property and supported Jesus out of it.[5] The twelve disciples possessed money for the purchase of food and the giving of alms.[6] We can even enumerate from the Gospels a number of services for which Jesus more or less clearly sanctioned the disbursement of property[7]: first, and most obvious, is the provision of the bodily needs of ourselves and those dependent on us—even the sinful earthly father must know how to give good gifts to his children.[8] Then there is the payment of taxes—

[1] Despite Mt xix. 10 f. As W. C. Allen says: "The whole section in Mt suffers from inconsistency of thought due to literary revision and compilation" (*Intern. Crit. Comm.*, p. 205). Cf Isaac Taylor, *The Natural History of Enthusiasm*, p. 224 note.

[2] Mt vi. 32.

[3] Mc i. 16–18, 29, ii. 1: cf Lc v. 1–11, Jn xxi. 3.

[4] Jn ii. 12.

[5] Lc viii. 3.

[6] Mc vi. 37 ||s; Jn iv. 8, xii. 6, xiii. 29.

[7] Lc xvi. 10–12 seems to refer to the faithful use of one's property as a trust.

[8] Mt vi. 32 f, vii. 9–11 ||; Mc v. 43, vi. 37 ||s; Jn iv. 8.

rendering to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.[1] Then there is almsgiving—the practice of mercy towards those who are suffering from the scarcity of earthly goods.[2] Then there is the formation of friendships, as seems to be intended by those somewhat obscure words, "Make for yourselves friends out of the Mammon of unrighteousness, so that when it fails they may receive you into the eternal dwellings."[3] And then, lastly, there is the expression of personal homage and worship, as we see it in our Lord's payment of the Temple-tax,[4] the widow's mite cast into the Temple-treasury,[5] and the woman's spikenard poured over Jesus' feet in anticipation of his burial.[6] All these imply the rightfulness of possessing, and therefore presumably also of acquiring property.

6. But inasmuch as nothing lends itself to abuse more easily than the pursuit of money, Jesus couples the most stringent warnings with his guarded permission of it. It is not putting it too strongly to say that he definitely *deprecates the keen pursuit of wealth*[7]—and that on three main grounds. Firstly, because the possession of it is in the highest degree precarious—thieves steal it, worms corrode it,[8] death transfers it to another.[9] Secondly, because it diverts men from the interests of the Kingdom,

[1] Mc xii. 17 ||s. The political implications of this passage will be discussed later (pp. 150 f, 169).

[2] Mt v. 7, 42, vi. 2–4, 22 f || (see p. 135 n 5), xxv. 31–46; Jn xii. 5, xiii. 29; Mc x. 21, xiv. 7 ||s; Lc vi. 37 f, xi. 41, xii. 33, xiv. 12–14; Ac xx. 35.

[3] Lc xvi. 9.

[4] Mt xvii. 24–27.

[5] Mc xii. 41–44 ||: cf Jn xiii. 29.

[6] Mc xiv. 3–9 ||s.

[7] Mc vii. 21–23 || ('covetousness'); Lc xvi. 14 f.

[8] Mt vi. 19–21 ||.

[9] Lc xii. 13–21: cf vi. 24 f, xvi. 25.

so much so that it is easier for a camel to pass through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom.[1] People tend to worry about acquiring property, instead of seeking first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness.[2] "The anxieties of the world and the pleasure of riches . . . enter in and stifle the word."[3] Hence Jesus describes the poor as the fittest recipients of his Gospel.[4] And then thirdly, the pursuit of wealth tends to make men selfish and heartless towards the needy. The parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus is Jesus' classical utterance under this head.[5] It is at this point that the modern Socialist, whose chief concern is the immense injustice of the unequal distribution of wealth in the world, feels closest contact with Jesus.

7. But there is perhaps *no subject on which the true bearing of our Lord's teaching on modern life is so difficult as this of personal property.* The difficulty is due firstly to the fact that a certain amount of his teaching (unfortunately we do not know how much) was what it was by reason of certain special conditions of his time, for example, the crude notion of economics in those days, the special demands of his Palestinian mission, the personal and spiritual needs of certain individuals to whom he spoke (like the rich young Ruler), the oriental custom of hospitality, the very climate of Palestine,[6] the prospect

[1] Mc x. 23–28 ||s. [2] Mt vi. 24 ||, xxii. 5; cf Lc xiv. 18 f.
[3] Mc iv. 18 f ||s.
[4] Lc iv. 18, vi. 20 (but cf Mt v. 3), vii. 22 ||.
[5] Lc xvi. 19–31. Cf Mc xii. 40 ||, Mt xxiii. 25 ||; also Mt vi. 22 f ||, Mc vii. 22 (the evil eye=unwillingness to impart one's goods to others; Deut xv. 9, etc).
[6] For the facilitation of ascetism by climatic conditions, see I. Taylor, *Natural History of Enthusiasm*, pp. 205–207.

of the immediate coming of the Kingdom: all these had their effect in moulding Jesus' teaching; and some allowance has to be made for all of them in applying that teaching to the different and far more complicated circumstances of our own industrial and democratic age. Also, what changes does the extensive action of the modern state in the relief of poverty call for in the matter of private charity? And secondly, we are in difficulties over the inherent subtlety of the subject itself. I acknowledge my duty to feed myself and my wife and children—I also acknowledge my duty to give alms: but how am I to hold the balance between these two duties? I admit my duty to help both the deserving and the undeserving poor: but what method of almsgiving enables me to do this best? Furthermore, in this matter of acquiring property, it is right to 'take thought,' and wrong to worry: but how can I know where one passes into the other? It is right to earn, but wrong to steal[1]: yet the two are connected by a set of stages that shade off imperceptibly into one another. What is the boundary between honest earning and business shrewdness, between business shrewdness and covetousness, between covetousness and overreaching, between overreaching and unjust gain, between unjust gain and theft? The profiteer is often perfectly innocent so far as the law of the land is concerned, but is he morally innocent? and if not, at what point does he cease to be an honourable business man and become a profiteer? The whole subject bristles with subtleties and uncertainties. One of the most urgent problems of our time is this of the duty of

[1] Mc vii. 21–23, x. 19 ||s.

Christian people in an economic world so totally different from that which Jesus envisaged—a world of keen competition, trade-unions, machinery, investments, credits, strikes, and all the myriad complications of modern industry and finance. It is quite easy to see that many existing institutions and conditions are unchristian and wrong; it is not very difficult to frame Utopian schemes under which the wrongs we deplore would not exist: but we want more than this. We want to know what is the best course for a Christian individual (or group) to take while necessarily remaining in economic contact at a thousand points with a world that does not yet, and will not for a long time, accept any good Utopian scheme. To delineate such a scheme clearly, to subject it to the criticism of others and so eliminate its flaws, to get it known and discussed, to make others besides oneself enthusiastic about it, to discover and point out practicable means by which it may be realized—all this is right and good: but what is still more urgent is to know the Christian thing to do pending its realization, while evil conditions still remain. And for this task—as well as for the detailed delineation of our Utopia—we are thrown almost entirely on our own resources, and get but little help from the words of one who was never faced with the problem as it challenges us. It is only the most general economic principles that we can gather from him: for the practical application of them we are left to ourselves; and a great deal of clear thinking will be needed before a satisfactory decision is reached. In the meantime the best we can do is to keep the problem steadily before us, and to steer our own personal course according

to the best light we have on each case of difficulty that occurs, keeping ourselves always in the spirit of Jesus and remembering always the Golden Rule and the paramount interests of the Kingdom of God.

8. We need however to be on our guard against the *popular fallacy* that, because all is not clear in this field, because we cannot take this or that saying of Jesus on economic matters and conform to it immediately, therefore we are equally exempt (on the ground of various great changes in the conditions of life) from complying with what he says in every other direction, notably in some special matters with which we have yet to deal. The solution of the problems of Christian ethics in obedience to the teaching of Jesus must necessarily take place piecemeal—as a gradual process, proceeding in the order of the relative clarity of the issues raised. Perplexity and indecision at one point need not mean perplexity and indecision at all points. Emerson's declaration that " a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds " was a recommendation, not that men need not mind being illogical, but that they need not mind that inconsistency into which a growing knowledge of truth always tends to throw men's present utterances as compared with their past. We are perfectly within our rights in adhering to a statement that we believe to be clearly made out, even though we are aware all the time, and are ready to admit, that it may have implications, as to the ultimate bearing of which we have to confess ourselves in doubt. We could rightly urge in our defence what was said to Dr. Johnson's Rasselas by the artist with his aeroplane : " Nothing

will ever be attempted, if all possible objections must first be overcome." Not only so, but we can go further and say, that without this measure of boldness future progress is impossible. Only by advancing up to the furthest limits of the light now given to us, can we hope to receive further light on harder and more complicated problems.[1]

[1] "Who shall say how much light would suddenly come in upon the obscurer matters, if once the simpler were taken out of the way?" (Isaac Taylor, *Fanaticism*, p. 364).

G. *OUR DUTY TO WRONGDOERS*

1. We have now to examine that difficult and controversial part of our subject—the Christian *treatment of wrongdoers*. It will perhaps conduce to clearness if we make it our first object to ascertain the actual views of Jesus on the matter, without attempting to criticize them on our own part. The task of evaluating his teaching for modern life must be kept distinct from the task of understanding what that teaching was.

2. Now just as, in medicine, diagnosis has to precede treatment, so in this matter, we must first ask, *How far are we capable of discerning wrongdoing?* On this point Jesus does not depart widely from the accepted canons of his religious fellow-countrymen. Those whom he expected to be able to recognize the work of God's Spirit in the cure of diseased men,[1] he must have regarded as equally capable of recognizing moral evil when they saw it. As a tree is known by its fruit, so is a man known by the life he lives and the words he speaks out of the fulness of his heart.[2] Jesus' declaration that all human defilement proceeded from within, out of the heart of man, and his list of these defilements, implied the broad accuracy of human judgment

[1] Mt xii. 24–32 ||s : cf 7.
[2] Mt vii. 16–18, 20, xii. 33–35; Lc vi. 43–45.

as to what defilement consisted of.[1] But judgment, in the sense of recognition of the fact of wrongdoing, is not judgment in the sense of censuring the wrongdoer. Judgment, in this latter sense, Jesus forbids. "Judge not," he says, "that you may not be judged (yourselves)." Pull the plank out of your own eye before trying to pull the splinter out of your brother's eye.[2] Not only are the innocent not to be condemned, but not even are the guilty. No sin is more unmistakable or inexcusable than adultery: but what did Jesus say to the adulteress? "Woman, where are thine accusers? Has no one condemned thee? . . . Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more."[3]

3. In legislating therefore for the diagnosis of wrongdoing, Jesus forbids the condemnation of the wrongdoer. We shall see that there are other things he forbids; but lest we should drop into the error of supposing that his attitude to wrongdoing was simply negative, let us realize at once that his policy for the treatment of it is a very positive one—it is that of *overcoming evil with good*. As the Heavenly Father is perfect, distributing His gracious gifts to all, searching for and desiring to save that which is lost, so the Christian, in order that he may become God's son, is to love even his enemies and to do good to those that hate him.[4] If ever he is in the wrong himself, he is to hasten to make amends, even if the quest for reconciliation involves the leaving undone of some ceremonial duty.[5] He is to let his light shine before men, so as to lead them to

[1] Mc vii. 21–23 ||. [2] Mt vii. 1–5 ||. [3] Jn viii. 10 f.
[4] Mt v. 43–48, xviii. 12–14; Lc xv. 1–10, xix. 10.
[5] Mt v. 23 f: cf Mc ix. 50 b.

glorify God.[1] He is to use what opportunities he has for propagating, by word and deed, the Gospel of the Kingdom.[2] The disciple of Jesus is to copy God in the effort to break down human sin by persistent and aggressive love. He is to inherit the earth by being gentle.[3]

4. From this main principle follow all the *definite precepts—positive and negative*—which Jesus issues on the subject. We are to be peace-makers, in order that we may be called God's sons.[4] We are to come to terms with our enemy while we have opportunity, and so to prevent the further embitterment of the contest.[5] We are to be gentle, as Jesus himself was, and harmless as doves.[6] We are to love our enemies.[7] Not only are we not to kill or to retaliate: but we are not even to resist, or to refuse an unfair demand, or to use angry words.[8] Nor are we to be afraid even of being killed by others.[9]

5. Jesus speaks very frequently about the disciple's duty of *forgiving* those who have wronged him; and it is sometimes said that the fulfilment of this duty is dependent on the repentance or apology of the wrongdoer; that is to say, that failing this repentance and apology, forgiveness is not demanded of us. There is a sense in which this qualification is true. In so far as forgiveness

[1] Mt v. 13–16.

[2] Mc i. 17 ||s, v. 19 f ||; Mt x. 7, 27 ||s; Lc x. 9: cf Lc ix. 60, Mc ix. 38 ff ||, Mt vii. 22, xxiii. 13 ||, Lc xvi. 27–31.

[3] Mt v. 5. [4] Mt v. 9. [5] Mt v. 25 f ||.

[6] Mt v. 5, x. 16, xi. 29. [7] Mt v. 44 f ||.

[8] Mt v. 21 f, 38–42 ||; Mc x. 19 ||s, vii. 21 || ('murders,' literally, 'acts of killing'): cf Lc ix. 54 ff, Mt xxvi. 52.

[9] Mt x. 28, 31 ||.

means reconciliation, the formation or re-formation of brotherly relationships, clearly it is impossible without repentance on the part of the wrongdoer. So Jesus says: "If thy brother sin, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him," and this until seventy times seven.[1] And in the great parable of the unforgiving slave who owed his master money, forgiveness all through is assumed to depend on its being asked for.[2] But this is not the only sense in which forgiveness is demanded of us. There is a sense in which it must not wait on the wrongdoer's repentance, but can and must be given as soon as the wrong is committed. For how could Jesus tell us to pray, "Forgive us our debts, as we too have forgiven our debtors,"[3] or how could he say, "Whenever ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against anyone,"[4] if that forgiveness were possible only when our enemies have repented. He himself did not wait for his murderers to repent before he forgave them; but he prayed for their pardon while they were in the very act of crucifying him.[5]

6. Jesus, however, is very far from meaning that we are to treat the wrongdoing of others as if it did not exist. It is true that he ruled out as ineffective and wrong most of the accepted methods of dealing with it, and that he regarded—as we have seen—the normal activities of a loving Christian life, when divorced from those wrong methods, as the most powerful weapon for the conquest of sin.

[1] Lc xvii. 3 f; Mt xviii. 21 f.

[2] Mt xviii. 23–35. Cf the unforgiving attitude of the repentant prodigal's elder brother (Lc xv. 25–32).

[3] Mt vi. 12 ||, 14 f. [4] Mc xi. 25. [5] Lc xxiii. 34.

But he realized that love for sinners does not exclude certain special ways of opposing or reacting against their sin. He grants, for instance, the use of *rebuke and remonstrance*, distinguishing it apparently from the condemnation which he forbade. "If thy brother sin, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him." [1] "If thy brother sin, go and convince him (of his sin) between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother." [2] Jesus himself rebuked the Traders in the Temple-courts [3]: he rebuked the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees; he rebuked Peter for his aversion to the Messiah's sacrifice [4]; he rebuked Judas for his treacherous kiss; [5] he rebuked the men who arrested him for their unreasonableness.[6] The aim of rebuke was to produce conviction of sin; and Jesus deprecated the use of it beyond the point where it had any chance of being successful. Thus, if an erring brother refused to admit the appeal either of the comrade he had wronged, or of two or three others called in ad hoc, or of his assembled fellow-disciples, he was to be treated as an outsider,[7] i.e. not worried further. What is holy is not to be given to dogs, and pearls are not to be offered to swine.[8] There is traceable in Jesus' method a certain *concealment* of the truth from those who were unworthy to receive it. The mysteries of the Kingdom are imparted to the disciples, but concealed under parables for the multitude.[9] When an evil and adulterous generation

[1] Lc xvii. 3.
[2] Mt xviii. 15: cf 16 f.
[3] Mc xi. 17 ||s; Jn ii. 16.
[4] Mc viii. 31–33 ||.
[5] Mt xxvi. 50; Lc xxii. 48.
[6] Mc xiv. 48 f ||s: cf Jn xviii. 22 f.
[7] Mt xviii. 16 f.
[8] Mt vii. 6.
[9] Mt xiii. 10–15 ||s.

demands a sign, the request is met with a blank refusal of any further sign beyond the sign of Jonah.[1] Jesus declined, when questioned, to say by what authority he acted.[2] When he stood before his accusers and judges, he refused to answer most of their questions.[3]

7. We find Jesus also commending a certain attitude of *caution* towards some of the evildoers of his time. "Beware of false prophets."[4] "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees . . . and of Herod."[5] "Beware of the Scribes, who like to walk about in long robes and (to receive) salutations in the market-places."[6] "See that no-one leads you astray; for many will come in my name, saying 'I am the Messiah,'" and so on.[7] "Behold, I send you out like sheep among wolves: become therefore prudent like the snakes."[8] "Take heed for yourselves, and beware of men; for they will hand you over to councils, and in the synagogues will they scourge you."[9] In keeping with this policy of caution, there is to be, under certain conditions, a *withdrawal* from the company of evil men. "Let

[1] Mc. viii. 11–13; Mt xii. 38 f, 41 (verse 40 is clearly an unintelligent gloss, for (1) the Gospels do not represent Jesus as being three days and three nights in the tomb, but only one whole day, a part of two days, and two nights, (2) the interpretation here given to the sign of Jonah is inconsistent with that of the following verse, which has the support of Lc xi. 32, (3) it is in the highest degree unlikely that Jesus would have mocked inquirers with so unintelligible a sign as the similarity between his own stay in the tomb and Jonah's sojourn in the whale's belly: besides, the risen Jesus did not appear to the Pharisees), xvi. 1–4; Lc xi. 29–32.

[2] Mc xi. 27–33 ||s.

[3] Mt xxvi. 63, xxvii. 12–14 ||; Lc xxiii. 9.

[4] Mt vii. 15.

[5] Mc viii. 15 ||s.

[6] Mc xii. 38 ||.

[7] Mc xiii. 5 f, 21–23 ||s.

[8] Mt x. 16.

[9] Mc xiii. 9; Mt x. 17.

them alone," says Jesus of the Pharisees, "(for) they are blind guides."[1] When he had cut short his critics with the sign of Jonah, "he left them and departed."[2] When he sent out his disciples on their mission-journeys, he told them, if they were persecuted in one city, to flee to the next. "And whoever does not receive you or listen to your words, when ye come out from that house or that city, shake off the dust from your feet as a testimony against them."[3] But apparently this attitude of cautious aloofness was to be carried no further than the hostility of men and the consequent impossibility of convincing them rendered absolutely necessary. Jesus does not sanction a general separation of Christians from the society in which they live. The parables of the field sown with wheat and tares and of the net that gathered fish of every kind, showed that he regarded such a separation as impossible, and the attempt to effect it as therefore wrong.[4] Despite obdurate hostility and persecution, and the consequent need for a certain amount of secrecy and caution, Christians are to live in the world as its light to guide it, its salt to preserve it, and its yeast to leaven it throughout.[5]

[1] Mt xv. 14.
[2] Mc viii. 13; Mt xvi. 4.
[3] Mt x. 13–15, 23 ||s.
[4] Mt xiii. 24–30, 36–43, 47–50.
[5] Mt v. 13–16, xiii. 33 ||s.

H. *OUR DUTY TO OTHERS POLITICALLY*

1. As we have now described the general principles which Jesus laid down for dealing with wrongdoers, it remains for us to consider their applicability to practical life. We shall hardly be misinterpreting the mind of to-day in saying that the chief difficulty, with which those who would practice these principles are confronted, is, not their uselessness in private and personal relationships or in what is called specifically 'religious work' (for it is generally admitted that they are right and valid in these fields), but their apparent incongruity with *social and political responsibility*. That being so, the discussion of their applicability, which was purposely held over at the beginning of the last section,[1] really becomes a discussion of the Christian's duty in his social and political capacity, his duty as a citizen, member, and subject of a state, both towards the state itself, towards his fellow-citizens, and towards the nationals of other countries. This question has been the occasion of the sharpest conflict of opinion among professedly Christian men of first-rate intellect and character; and the utmost care must be used, and the greatest clearness aimed at, if we are to thread our way successfully through the intricacies of the problem.

[1] See p. 140.

2. Discussions on the topic often err, either *by treating it as if it were simpler, or else by treating it as if it were more complicated, than it really is.* There are those who say: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," and "The powers that be are ordained of God," and, on the strength of these and similar texts, take it to be the duty of the Christian individual to carry out any and every order the State may give him, and confine the application and operation of the Christian principles of conduct strictly to the narrow area of private life which the demands of the State happen to leave untouched. This mistaken conclusion is not unlike that arrived at by those who allow themselves to be confused by the idea of some mysterious sanctity which they regard as attaching to the State and which makes the whole question of Christian ethics far more complicated than it really need be. The topic is indeed at once simple and complicated, according to the point of view from which it is regarded; but it is neither of these in the sense of necessitating a subordination of the Kingdom of God and the duties pertaining thereto to the State and its demands upon the citizen.

3. Let us ask ourselves to start with, *What really is the State?* It is surely the organization which expresses the collective will of a certain more or less arbitrarily defined group of our fellow-men. The State is thus 'our neighbour' in a special sense, and has just as much or just as little sacro-sanctity or mystery or right or claim or goodness or badness as our fellow-men in general have. So that the duties which the Christian owes to the State are simply special applications of those principles which

are to govern his attitude to his fellow-men in general. Our duties to our fellow-men are roughly those of love, kindness (or we might say service), wisdom, truthfulness, and humility: we are to treat others, not necessarily as they want us to treat them, but as we should like them to treat us, if we, while still Christians, were in their position.[1] Towards wrong-doers our attitude clearly must not be one of imitation, but rather a firm adherence to our ideals, coupled with gentleness, charitable judgment, forgiveness, and (where they are likely to be helpful) remonstrance and rebuke.

4. It is not very difficult to see *what these principles amount to* when we attempt to apply them to the Christian's duty in his relations with the State. They clearly exclude anything like violent resistance to the State or overt rebellion against it, involving the use of arms.[2] We remember that Jesus refused to allow himself to be made a king.[3] His principles exclude, furthermore, all bitterness and ill-will, though leaving room for criticism and remonstrance. It is

[1] See above p. 121.

[2] I fail to see any means of explaining the third (Matthæan) temptation (Mt iv. 8–10 ||), except on the assumption that the unspecified sin involved in bowing down and worshipping Satan was the bloodshed involved in the rebellion or war of conquest that would have been necessary in order to give Jesus the kingdoms of the world. The idea that the sin was earthly pleasure (O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus*, ET, p. 148), or pride (Sanday, in Hastings' *DB* ii, p. 612 b) or ambition (Ewald, quoted by Farrar, *Life of Christ*, i, p. 139), is quite inadequate. Nor is it an explanation to say that Jesus did not want a 'worldly' kingdom (Neander, *Life of Christ*, ET, pp. 76 f, 89). He certainly did want universal lordship, and on other occasions did not hesitate to advance his claims to it. How did a worldly kingdom differ from his, except in having to be won and maintained by the use of violence and bloodshed?

[3] Jn vi. 15.

under this heading that we should place his denunciation of the religious leaders of his own nation,[1] the depreciatory tone in which he referred to the grandeur of Solomon[2] and the soft clothing of courtiers,[3] and his whole attitude of disapproval towards Herod.[4] They involve further:

(i) Obedience, in a general way, to government-orders, that being demanded by the general principles of goodwill, gentleness, and service. So Jesus bids the cleansed leper offer the legally appointed sacrifice,[5] and tells the disciples and the people to do whatever the scribes and Pharisees enjoin, because they sit in Moses' seat.[6] Another exemplification of the same general duty is the going of the second mile, when we are 'impressed' to go one.[7]

(ii) The payment of taxes, as a special form of obedience. Not only does Jesus pay the Temple-tax, though he seems to have thought it unfair,[8] but he even says, in reference to the Roman tribute, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's."[9] It is true that this phrase implies the extension of a certain relative justification to Cæsar's government, a point on which we shall say more in a moment: but we must be careful not to make the words mean more than they say. They certainly are not equivalent to: Do anything that Cæsar

[1] Mt xxiii. etc. Phrases like "Ye serpents, ye offspring of vipers" (verse 33) are a difficulty in face of v. 21 f, explain them how we will.

[2] Mt vi. 29 ||: cf xii. 42 ||.

[3] Mt xi. 8 ||.

[4] Mc viii. 15; Lc xiii. 32.

[5] Mc i. 44 ||s; Lc xvii. 14.

[6] Mt xxiii. 1–3, 23 ||.

[7] Mt v. 41: the reference is to the system of forced labour for the State, not conscription for military service, from which the Jews were exempt so far as the Roman armies were concerned.

[8] Mt xvii. 24–27.

[9] Mc xii. 17 ||s.

may find it necessary or convenient to ask of you. The command is simply a special application of the general precept: "Give to him that asketh thee,"[1] and (though this analogy does not run on all fours) it no more makes the man who obeys it responsible for what Cæsar does with his money than a householder is responsible for what his grocer does with the money when a bill is paid.

(iii) Thirdly, these principles involve submission to unjust treatment. When the law court sentences you wrongly to forfeit your cloak, give up your tunic as well.[2] The forced labour just referred to under the general orders of government would doubtless be regarded by most Jews as coming under the head of unrighteous acts of oppression. When you are persecuted, flee to another city: but in any case do not be afraid of those who can kill the body only.[3] Though Jesus sometimes protests against the wrongdoing of governors,[4] yet at other times—e.g. when Herod executed John,[5] or when Pilate slaughtered the Galileans,[6] or when Kaiaphas and Pilate and Herod were judging him[7]—Jesus preserved a dignified silence, clearly on the principle that it was no use giving what was sacred to the dogs or casting pearls before swine.[8] He submitted without a struggle to the indignities inflicted on him by the various governing bodies into whose hands he fell, in obedience to his own general precept not to withstand him who is evil, but to turn to him the other cheek.[9]

[1] Mt v. 42 ||.
[2] Mt v. 40.
[3] Mt x. 23, 28, 31 ||s.
[4] See above, p. 150 n 1 and 4.
[5] Mc vi. 17–29 ||s.
[6] Lc xiii. 1–3.
[7] See p. 145 n 3.
[8] Mt vii. 6.
[9] Mt v. 39.

(iv) Lastly, these principles involve co-operation. Obedience itself is a form of co-operation. In our own day, when the private citizen has so much larger a share in the work of government than he could have under the autocratic systems of Jesus' day, this duty of co-operation will bulk more largely in the scheme of Christian life than was possible in New Testament times.[1] But no new principle is involved. It is the Christian's duty to lend a hand in all good work that is going forward, so far as it is feasible for him to do it : and he ought not to be deterred because such a course may involve co-operation with others whose agreement with him may extend no further than the particular service in which they are both to be associated. In rendering first aid in a street accident, the Christian would not pause to ask whether his helpers agreed with him on questions of religion and morals and politics, before he allowed himself to work with them. In the same way, if the State is doing any piece of work of which the Christian himself approves and in which his help is wanted, he is right to render that help, even though there may be many matters on which his views and those of his rulers do not coincide.

5. Nothing that has been said in regard to the twin duties of obedience and co-operation, is exempt from the proviso that *the act involved in obedience or co-operation must itself be in conformity with, or*

[1] " The leading minds of Christendom have declined to recognise, except in cases of special vocation, as the duty of Christians, the abdication of responsibility for the problems, the entanglements, the more or less secular issues of the ordinary social life of mankind " (Campion, in *Lux Mundi*, p. 319). Quite true—but with qualifications, as will be shown in the sequel.

at any rate must not contradict, the Law of the Kingdom of God promulgated and in great measure elaborated in the teaching of Jesus. Obedience to men is a Christian duty, but only in so far as it does not involve disobedience to God. Co-operation with others is a Christian duty, but only in so far as there is common ground between the Christian and his fellows. What is to be done when the powers that be require of us acts which God has forbidden? or when our fellow-men demand that we shall take a hand in what is contrary to our Master's teaching?

Normally speaking, such cases do not arise, because the State's requirements consist in the main of the observance of the more simple and obvious human duties and virtues, that is to say, in what is common to the ethics of humanity at large and the ethics of Jesus. But we have to remember that, extensive as is the common ground between the Christian and the average morally-minded man, their convictions do not coincide: also that, in the time of Jesus and for a long time after, the vast majority of the members of society were clearly non-Christian. During the Middle Ages, in which Christian ethics were largely snowed under, the enforced nominal Christianity of every citizen obscured the distinction between Christian and pagan conduct; but modern times, when professed Christianity is not as fashionable as it was, and when everyone is perfectly free to dissociate himself from Christianity if he wishes to do so, have reproduced in a measure the primitive cleavage, despite the facts that Christianity as professed to-day is a very much watered-down article compared with that of the first centuries, and that the world as a whole has been to a considerable

extent leavened with Christian principles. There is a general agreement to-day that the society in which we live is, though not uninfluenced by Christian ideals, in the main predominantly pagan.[1] If that can be truly said of the bulk of the population, it follows that it can also be said of the government; for a representative government is bound to represent fairly accurately the average moral standard of the community it controls.[2]

Now a pagan government is always liable to demand from its Christian subjects something which as Christians they are forbidden to give. We are familiar with the production of such a situation in the early Church. In effect the State said to the Christians: "You can believe what you like, and worship and live as you like: but as subjects of the Empire you must recognize the Empire's gods, and take your share, by occasionally sacrificing to them, in soliciting Divine favour for the Empire." To which the Christians replied: "We are willing to obey the Emperor, and to pray to our God for him, and to pay his taxes, and to live as peaceable and

[1] See above, pp. 14–16 n 1.

[2] Cf the sage words of W. E. Channing, quoted by Martineau, *Essays, Reviews and Addresses*, i. p. 132: "We choose to have a popular government, but are not willing to accept its essential condition, namely, that it shall have the imperfections of the people. An absolute sovereign may get in advance of his people, but a people cannot get in advance of itself, and it must govern according to its own character." Also, Miss M. D. Petre, in *The Hibbert Journal*, April 1920, p. 466: "The State cannot, must not outstrip the level of its own citizens; in regard to human ideals it must be executive rather than originative. As society rises the State rises; were rulers to attempt a national policy that was too exalted for those in whose behalf they held office, they would be tyrants, even though beneficent ones. In point of fact, this is not a danger to be apprehended."

moral citizens: but to offer sacrifices to him as a deity or to any other so-called deity, other than the One Supreme God, is a thing we must not, cannot, and will not do." [1] Here was a clear case of conflict of loyalties: and we know how much torture and bloodshed had to be endured by those who felt the Christian claim to be supreme, before they wrung from their unwilling rulers the right to do as their consciences bade them.

6. Religious persecution has long been a thing of the past: no Christian nowadays is called upon to suffer for refusing to worship the national deities Society has been humanized and in some measure christianized, so that many a Christian to-day lives unconscious of any serious cleavage between himself and his fellow-Christians on the one hand and their pagan fellow-men on the other. But, as a matter of fact, there is still—over and above occasional overtly immoral or mistaken movements in society—there is still one point on which civilized society, in other words the State, avowedly and confidently professes a policy which is at variance with Christian teaching, rightly understood; I mean, *the violent coercion and punishment of wrongdoers.* It coerces criminals within its borders by its law-courts, its police force, its prisons and executions. It coerces enemies beyond its borders by means of all the unspeakable and bloody cruelties of warfare.[2]

[1] They had the sanction of Jesus for this intransigent attitude; Mc viii. 38; Mt x. 17 f, 26 f, 32 f, xxv. 36 ff (Christians in prison); Lc ix. 26, xii. 8–12. For the stand they made in the preliminary conflict with the Jewish rulers, see Ac iv. 19 f, v. 29.

[2] It is essential to a right consideration of the problem, that we should, even at the cost of unpleasantness and indelicacy, keep steadily before our minds the lengths to which a man to-day

7. I have already dealt with the question of the Christian's treatment of wrongdoers, and shown how *Jesus' precepts exclude every such act of coercion and*

must be prepared to go, if he is to associate himself with the State in its conduct even of a just quarrel with a foreign foe. Some years before the war I heard an officer under training quote the words of a sergeant giving instructions in the use of the bayonet: "Give the bayonet a twist as you pull it out so as to render the wownd mortial!" "You should see a man," writes Mr. E. W. Mason, "stabbing away with a bayonet at a sack supposed to represent an enemy—not a man, an enemy. Listen to the instructor:

'One, head; two, heart; three, guts.'

Is there not a certain pleasure in such efficiency?

'Three,' roars the instructor, and twenty men jab fifteen inches of steel in to 'his'—the enemy's, *bien entendu*—guts.

'Twist the bayonet as you pull it out so as to make a jagged gash,' is the order" (*Made Free in Prison* (1918), p. 101). Here is another example of the same sort of thing: "'Howl, damn yer, howl! Grit your teeth and grunt when you stick your bayonet in. In his stomach. Right in! Now get on! Oh GET ON! GET ON!' The voice would rise to an inarticulable yell, and with howls and glaring eyes the class would go whirling ahead to the next row of dummies" (R. B. Coulson, writing in *The Sunday Chronicle*, quoted in *The Crusader*, February 13, 1920). I have the personal testimony of one who was an officer in the Great War to the fact that the practice—referred to by Mr. Lowes Dickinson (*The Choice Before Us* (1917), p. 28)—of kicking the enemy in the genital organs is taught to the soldier as the thing to do in a bayonet fight, if the first thrust miscarries. Another resource in such an emergency is to thrust one's first and fourth fingers into the other man's eyes. These things are not printed in the Army's books of instruction, but are taught by word of mouth.

It is but too likely that the use of poisonous gas on the battlefield and the dropping of bombs on civilians, women, and children, will form part of the regular methods of civilized warfare in future.

I append four passages from *The Army and Religion* (italics mine). "A man has by the nature of his work and life" (in the Army) "to lower his whole spiritual being and blunt and deaden his capacity to suffer with Christ, as he gradually accustoms himself to the life he has to lead. Alas! it was but too easy for most of us to do this. But *I, for one, shall always protest against it as a final argument against warfare.* The hardening process the

injury as I have just referred to.[1] A word or two only, therefore, is necessary here in order to put this negative conclusion beyond dispute. The old command, "Thou shalt not murder," is more than once repeated by Jesus as one of his own laws[2]; the Greek word used in the Gospel version of it is one that covers ordinary slaughter in war as well as private murder; and we know how fond Jesus was of extending these old Mosaic rules to cover cases to which they were not usually thought to apply, but with which they were not wholly unconnected. His non-resistance teaching in the Sermon on the Mount is too explicit and well-known to need repetition.[3] His refusal at his Temptation to accept world-lordship at the price of bowing the knee to Satan is explicable only on the assumption that the use of arms (the one means by which that

soldier undergoes is not a strengthening but a weakening, a cutting away, a stunting of the whole man. I seemed to perceive in it the wisdom of *Christ's dislike of physical violence as a means to any spiritual end.* But although we were exceedingly adaptable in this hardening process, it produced a curious feeling of irritation, of secret guilt. It also produces, worst of all, a fatigue of the soul. *The act of fighting* is, and continues to be, a shock (in the mediæval" [sic. ? 'medical'] "meaning of the term) to the spirit of each individual soldier, whether he is conscious of it at the time or not, and the result of shock is a decline in the vitality of the patient, a lowering of pulse, a lowering of temperature" (pp. 84 f). "Army life deadens feeling and kills thought" (p. 88). "The manner of life of a soldier in camp, surrounded by all the most subtle temptations, . . . and in the trenches where they are out to slaughter the enemy, by sniping, bombing, raiding, or advancing, creates an atmosphere of sordid existence that has not an atom of faith or belief in the ideal life preached by religion" (p. 89). "There can be little doubt that, while the circumstances and conditions of warfare have rendered some religious as they were not before, others, and *a far larger number*, have lost what religion they had" (p. 91).

[1] See above, pp. 141–143.

[2] Mt v. 21 f, xix. 18 ||s.

[3] Mt v. 38–48 ||.

lordship could be speedily secured) was to him a forbidden means, the use of which would therefore have been equivalent to homage to Satan.[1] How can we explain his own quiet attitude in face of the cruelties and injustices of his day, except on the assumption that he felt it to be not merely untimely—but wrong—to raise a violent rebellion.[2] He forbids Peter in Gethsemane to use his sword in the defence of the innocent.[3] He holds up Gentile authority as a thing the disciples are to shun,[4] not because authority in itself is wrong (for Jesus himself claimed ascendancy over others [5] and promised it also to his disciples [6]), but because Gentile authority was of the kind that needs coercion and violence for its maintenance. The Law of Moses might sentence the adulteress to death; but Jesus refused to have any hand in executing the sentence.[7] He told his followers, when their country should be attacked by the Romans, to "flee to the mountains." [8]

It seems, therefore, quite impossible to find room in the example and teaching of Jesus for the forcible punishment of criminals and for the slaughter of foreign foes. Not only is this conclusion unmistakable as a correct inference from his ethical teaching, but it constitutes the one great characteristic of that teaching. The Rev. Richard Roberts stated lately: "There were great and notable virtues which men practised and praised before Jesus appeared—there was love of country, the sense of honour, the passion for righteousness, the love of

[1] See above, p. 149 n 2.
[2] See pp. 151 f.
[3] Mt xxvi. 51 f ||s.
[4] Mc x. 42–45 ||s.
[5] See above, pp. 44 f.
[6] See below, pp. 171 f.
[7] Jn vii. 53–viii. 11.
[8] Mc xiii. 14 ||s.

justice, the capacity for sacrifice. There is nothing distinctively or exclusively Christian about these. The one point at which Jesus taught a definite advance in the region of personal relationships was in His command that men should love their enemies. But this was a profound and far-reaching revolution." [1] And not only is this teaching the distinctive feature of Jesus' ethics on its human side: but it is the inseparable counterpart of that message of the self-sacrificing and suffering love of God which —made plain to us in the Saviour's Cross and Passion— —is the distinctive feature of the Christian Gospel.[2] The conquest of evil with good, therefore, involving the disuse of all violence and injury, is no mere accidental or casual element in Christian life, but the very thing which gives it a right to its distinctive name.[3]

[1] *The Hibbert Journal*, July, 1919, p. 670. Cf Ottley, in *Lux Mundi*, p. 365: "The inculcation of forgiveness is 'the most striking innovation' in the ethics of the Gospel."

[2] See above, p. 66 n 1.

[3] "What seized upon the imagination of mankind as the distinctive revelation of Christianity was the infinite love and tenderness and compassion of this Righteous God for sinful man. It was this which shone out in the character of Christ" (Moore in *Lux Mundi*, pp. 55 f).

"The non-resistance of Jesus, so far from being a strange or erratic part of his teaching, is an essential part of his conception of life and of his God-consciousness. When we explain it away or belittle it, we prove that our spirit and his do not coalesce. In the Sanhedrim, in the court of Pilate, amid the jests of the soldiers, Jesus had to live out the Father's mind and spirit. He did it in the combination of steadfastness and patience. The most striking thing in his bearing is his silence. He never yielded an inch, but neither did he strike back, or allow others to do it for him. 'If my kingdom were on a level with yours,' he said to Pilate, 'my followers would fight to protect me.' He did not answer force by force, nor anger by anger. If he had, the world at that point would have subdued him and he would have fallen

8. At the same time, it is not very difficult to prove that *there is a sense in which coercive violence in some measure is still necessary on the part of the State.* Thus Principal Griffith-Jones says: "In a mixed society composed partly of men and women who are pledged to evil, selfish, and criminal ways, and who do not acknowledge the rights of others, some organised form of force is absolutely essential in order to hold them in check and prevent them from criminal action—i.e. action inimical to the general well-being. This is the principle behind law and government in an ordered community, without which, indeed, no community can possibly maintain itself against the disruptive forces always present within it." [1] This is a temperate statement of the view entertained by most people, even most Christians; and it could easily be paralleled with many similar statements elsewhere.[2] And it is a statement which it is impossible to describe off-hand and without qualification as untrue. What we have to seek for is such an exact comprehension both of this position and of the ethic of Jesus that we shall be able to do justice to both of them without being inconsistent ourselves.

9. We must begin by setting aside *a number of*

away from God. If he had headed the Galilæans to storm Pilate's castle, he would have been a God-forsaken Christ" (Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, p. 263).

[1] *The Challenge of Christianity to a World at War*, p. 64.

[2] Compare, for example, the words of Neander in his *Life of Christ* (ET), p. 252 note w, of Campion in *Lux Mundi*, pp. 322 f, of Sanday, in Hastings' *DB* ii, pp. 621 b, 652 b, and of R. F. Rynd in *The Hibbert Journal*, July 1919, pp. 652–655. Dr. Sanday, however, is very conscious of being faced with an unsolved problem, and remarks that "he would welcome warmly any new light on the subject."

unsatisfactory views of Jesus' ethics, which have been put forward as abolishing without difficulty the clash between these ethics and the requirements of the State.

First, there is the idea that Jesus' teaching is meant to be applied only in a perfect state of society. Catholic apologists are fond of using this argument —but Protestants also are not innocent of it. It obviously will not hold water for a single moment: for if Jesus was legislating for a perfect state of society, what sense would there have been in his speaking about enemies, men taking away our cloak, striking us on the cheek, forcing us to go a mile, and so on? The very content of this teaching proves that, if it has an application at all, it must apply to life in a very imperfect state of society.

Then there is the plea that we are meant to follow, not the letter, but the spirit, of Jesus' words. Jesus, it is true, insisted on good motives and a right spirit as all-important; but this does not prove that he did not mean his followers to take seriously the concrete precepts which he gave to them as embodying the right spirit. When Jesus says: "Thou shalt not commit adultery," did he mean that men might ignore the letter of that commandment so long as they preserved its spirit? And if a severance between spirit and letter is inconceivable in such a case, why is it any more conceivable when he said: "Thou shalt not kill"? The prohibition of killing is no less integral a part of his conception of moral righteousness and the Will of God than is the prohibition of adultery.

Thirdly, it has been suggested that these precepts are meant to bind Christians in their private and

personal relationships, but not in their capacity as citizens. Thus, to quote Principal Griffith-Jones again: "While the duty of non-resistance to evil *is* a duty incumbent on every Christian disciple, as an individual, when his own interests alone are involved, it does not apply to him when attacked in his representative capacity as a citizen, whose rights he holds in trust for others as well as for himself." [1] But this distinction cannot be sustained in face of Jesus' words, at least so far as his own meaning is concerned; for if he had had such a distinction in mind, how could he have said: "If any man *go to law with thee* and take away thy cloak, let him have thy tunic also," and how could he have singled out for special prohibition that ancient 'Lex Talionis' —"eye for eye, tooth for tooth," etc.? For this law of retaliation was not simply a permission for the indulgence within limits of the desire for vengeance, but a public, legal, and official enactment, designed in the interests of society as a restraint upon wrongdoing, and doubtless meant to be carried out by (or under the supervision of) the public officers of the community.

Fourthly, and not unconnected with this last objection, there is the plea that Jesus forbade violence, as Principal Griffith-Jones admits, in self-defence, but would have commended it in defence of others. The Golden Rule [2] suffices to refute this idea—for clearly it tells us to defend others by that method of defence wherewith we ourselves would like to be defended: this means, ex hypothesi, by some means not involving damage to our assailant.

Fifthly, what about Jesus turning the traders out

[1] *Op cit*, p. 61.

[2] See above, p. 121.

of the Temple-courts ? [1] But there, the whip (mentioned in the Fourth Gospel only) was used simply for the purpose of driving the cattle (and what else could Jesus have used for the purpose ?) : and is it not perfectly obvious that, if ever one man expels a crowd, he cannot possibly do it by the use of physical force, but by some personal, moral, or magnetic compulsion ? [2] And in any case, what analogy is there between what Jesus did to the traders and what our own boys and the Germans were taught to do to one another ?

Sixthly, what about the chastisement of children ? But our children are part of ourselves,[3] not equal and responsible fellow-men : and our chastisement of them is a special form of that mastery over, and responsibility for, ourselves which at once constitutes and limits our freedom : it is therefore no rupture of loving fellowship, but is directed to their own good, and should always stop short of physical injury ; it is thus an altogether different thing from imprisonment, mutilation, and slaughter.

Seventhly, what about the restraint of violent lunatics ? Jesus cured by a gentle psychotherapy the violent lunatics he met ; and he clearly meant his followers to be able to do the same, and so indeed

[1] Mc xi. 15–18 ||s. I believe this incident took place at the very commencement of Jesus' public ministry, where the Fourth Gospel (Jn ii. 13–20) places it. I have explained my reasons in full in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1919, pp. 312–316.

[2] " The lifting up of the scourge could not have been in token of physical force, for—apart from Christ's character—what was one man against so many ? " (Neander, *Life of Christ*, (ET), p. 179). There is no support in any of the Gospel narratives for the idea (O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus*, ET, p. 414) that Jesus was aided by his disciples, and so effected the expulsion by main force.

[3] Horace Bushnell, *Christian Nurture*, pp. 14–16, 57 ff.

in after years they did : [1] but apart from that, the violent lunatic is not a normal or responsible being, and is therefore, like the child, in a special category. The ordinary wrongdoer is not in that category ; for if he were, we should be a race of madmen, and no rational treatment of our problem would be possible.

Eighthly, did not Jesus describe God as punishing sinners with severity ? [2] Yes, but God has prerogatives which we do not share [3] ; and if you doubt this, ask yourself whether you do not take a visitation from God very differently from the way in which you take an assault or even a punishment from a human being.

Ninthly, did not Jesus draw illustrations from war for Christian life ? Yes, he once did so [4] : but it was only an illustration, and it no more proves that Christians may fight than the reference to the day of Christ's appearance coming like a thief in the night [5] proves that Christians may commit burglary.

Tenthly and lastly, did not Jesus say that there would be wars and rumours of wars,[6] and did he not regard these as a Divine chastisement ? [7] Yes, he did speak so, and such may have been his meaning : but that no more permits Christians to take part in such wars than the familiar idea of persecution and pestilence being Divine chastisements constitutes

[1] See Harnack, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity* (ET), i. pp. 125–146, for an account of early Christian exorcism.

[2] E.g. Mt xviii. 34 f, xxii. 7, 13 ; Lc xix. 12, 14, 27.

[3] See above, p. 86.

[4] Lc xiv. 31 f.

[5] 1 Thess v. 2, 4 ; Rev iii. 3, xvi. 15 ; 2 Pet iii. 10 : cf Mt xxiv. 43 ||.

[6] Mc xiii. 7 f ||s.

[7] Mc xii. 9, xiii. 2 ||s ; Mt xi. 23 ||(?), xxii. 7 ; Lc xii. 54–xiii. 9, xxi. 20–24, xxiii. 28–31 ; and cf n 2 above.

a justification for Christians persecuting their fellows or spreading the germs of an epidemic disease.

10. There is thus no escape from the conclusion that Jesus meant his non-resistance teaching to be taken seriously and literally, i.e. in letter as well as in spirit, by all his true followers. We seem to be left with a hard irreducible discrepancy between the duty of society and the duty of the Christian individual or group. That discrepancy, however, if looked at the right way, is seen to be intelligible and explicable.

The difficulty of so regarding it arises from a quite frequent and rather natural neglect of *three facts*, which we must now proceed to take account of.

(i) This non-resistance, which Jesus enjoins, presupposes that the man who practises it is a Christian disciple: or, we might say, the practice of Christian non-resistance is strictly relative to—and dependent upon—the status of Christian discipleship. It is emphatically a counsel only for those who are Christians. Any conception, therefore, of its being used by a whole non-Christian community all at once is an absurdity (particularly when the community selected for so extraordinary an hypothesis is an arbitrarily chosen local group—one's own country, for instance, to the exclusion of others): and any objection to this teaching based on such a conception is consequently invalid. Here is, indeed, a sound and intelligible reason why this teaching can never be applied by a government representing a predominantly pagan community. But the reason which makes this teaching inapplicable to the Pagan State does not affect its applicability to the Christian individual.

(ii) The non-resistance teaching does not mean a purely negative and inactive attitude to wrong. It has a quite definite and effective positive counterpart —the overcoming of evil with good, the conversion of enemies to friends by loving them, the redemption of the lost by seeking them, the attainment of control —the inheritance of the earth—by gentleness.[1] This positive power of Christian gentleness is familiar enough to us in the stories of Jesus and of the early Church and of Christian missions: but it is usually ignored in arguments on the social and civic duties of Christians. Let us remember that the principles of Jesus, so far from leaving sin unchecked, check it far more effectively than any coercion or penalization can do.[2] How then can his followers be reproached for selfishly leaving the dirty work of society to others, when they are all the time busily accomplishing just what the 'dirty work' is meant to accomplish, and accomplishing it in a saner and wiser way of their own?

(iii) It follows from what has just been said that, inasmuch as the community of non-resisting Christians grows only gradually, no such cataclysm is to be feared as is often depicted by those who ask what would happen if to-morrow morning the British Fleet were sunk, and the Army, Navy, and Police force disbanded. Such objections are entirely beside the point. What the adoption of Christian non-resistance involves is the going on of two processes

[1] See above, p. 66 n 1.

[2] "In morals a good man is not simply a witness for virtue, but a means of repressing vice, of keeping alive in men a sense of duty, a consciousness of right, an ideal of the good and the true. 'Ye are the salt of the earth'" (Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 141).

pari passu, firstly, the gradual diminution in the number of wrongdoers, and secondly, the gradual substitution of spiritual for material, of Christian for pagan, of more effective for less effective, means of dealing with wrongdoers. What ground do such developments afford for the oft-repeated charge that Christian non-resistance means anarchy?

11. If the foregoing argument is accepted as cogent, *the resultant attitude of the modern Christian to the modern State* ought not to be difficult to ascertain. The Christian will refuse firmly to become a soldier, or a maker of shells, or a policeman, or a magistrate: for all these callings stand for the pagan method of handling the wrongdoer. He will not however for that reason be a mere cypher in the struggle which such callings carry on: he will be hard at work all the time, reconciling enemies, converting drunkards, reforming criminals, and generally purifying society and the world at large by his life, example, and influence. But though compelled at this one point to take a different line from his fellows, he will not therefore refuse all recognition of, or co-operation with, the State. He will realize that its use of coercion is an inevitable accompaniment of the unchristian or imperfectly Christian condition of the vast bulk of his fellow-countrymen: he will remember that even coercion—unchristian as it is [1]—represents the solemn and conscientious

[1] I trust it is unnecessary to urge that the actual existence of large numbers of professed and genuine Christians who participate freely and conscientiously in the coercive work of society as soldiers, magistrates, etc, neither invalidates the main argument here submitted, nor lays him who submits it open to the charge of presumption or intolerance or narrowness. We may freely recognise our neighbour as a fellow-Christian, while at the same time

conviction of other men, and that therefore those who bear the burden of government honestly are the servants of God (as Paul called them) [1] despite their imperfect grasp of Christian truth, and that the State itself, inasmuch as it embodies the conscience of the community, is (again as Paul called it) the institution of God. He will of course reserve to himself, and occasionally use, the right to remonstrate with the government when it falls signally below even that pagan or sub-Christian ideal which may reasonably be expected of it: but apart from such occasions, he will, for the reasons just given, extend a relative justification to the coercive machinery of the State, though he cannot himself co-operate in that machinery, being committed as a Christian to a different and better way of dealing with the same problem, a way which excludes coercion.[2] This relative justification of what seems right in his neighbour's eyes is the basis of whatever *compromise* there can rightly be between the Christian and the State. There has been much loose talk about compromise: and it is commonly thought that, when once compromise in any sense is admitted, the ideal

believing and pleading that something he is doing with full sincerity is inconsistent with those religious presuppositions which he holds in common with us, and while calling the something *in that sense* unchristian.

[1] Rom xiii. 1–7.

[2] Notice the very significant parallelism and contrast between Rom xii. 17–21 and Rom xiii. 1–6, particularly between xii. 19, which forbids the *Christian* to avenge himself or to make himself the instrument of the (i.e. God's) wrath, and xiii. 4, which describes the *Pagan* magistrate as a servant of God for the infliction of God's wrath as vengeance on the wrongdoer. (For the meaning of the wrath and vengeance of God, see above, p. 164.) How far Paul was from contemplating Christians as magistrates, we can see from 1 Cor vi. 1–8: cf v. 12 f.

is in some way given up or its full beauty in some way smirched. But this is true only if the compromise involves the individual who makes it in an act which conflicts with his personal fulfilment of his own ideals : it is not true of that compromise which is simply carrying to its logical conclusion the Christian's relative justification of what seems right, not to himself, but to his neighbour.[1] While the question of the way in which this relative justification should be expressed is admittedly a complicated and controversial one, particularly in regard to its details, I should myself plead that the following acts fall well within the limits of compromise in its legitimate sense :—

(i) The payment of taxes.[2] Here we have, besides the sanction of our Lord's words, the simple fact that the man or men who take money from us under threat of compulsion if we refuse it, are not only as free as we are to do what they believe to be right, but are themselves responsible for the use they make of what they receive from us. This responsibility of theirs clearly limits our own.

[1] Thus it was that Jesus 'relatively justified' Moses in permitting the Israelites *as a legislator* to divorce their wives. This was not really inconsistent with his own clear statement that divorce was an infringement of God's purpose and his insistence that his own followers should not practice it (see above, pp. 130 f) : but it might well have been called, in a certain sense of the word, a compromise. The neglect of this element of 'relativity' has landed our ecclesiastical leaders in difficulties in the face of proposed changes in the English law on the subject. They start from the false assumption that England is a Christian country.

[2] See above, pp. 150 f.

(ii) Voting. It is clear that if I vote for any political measure to-day, I am voting for something which, if passed into law, will be enforced by coercion (of which I personally disapprove) if anyone in the country refuses to bow to it. But my disapproval of coercion is relative to a certain religious status which is not shared by the bulk of my fellow-men; and the question: "Shall I vote?" therefore simply becomes the question: "Shall I express a preference for the better of two policies, when the best of all is for the present unattainable owing to the hardness of men's hearts?" Personally, I answer that question unhesitatingly in the affirmative, as it seems to me a simple expression of that necessary 'relative justification' which I am bound to extend to the conscientious acts of my fellow-men.

(iii) Obedience to, service of, and co-operation with, the Government, in all matters, such as the benevolent service of our fellows, in regard to which we can stand on common ground, despite the fact that this means working with those who hold on many other matters very different views from our own. The position of those who will not associate with others in anything unless they can associate in everything seems to me short-sighted and wrong. It rules out the hope of the christianization of the world by practical means. For with the constant growth of the Christian spirit and the dissemination of

Christian ideals, the area of common ground between the Christian and his pagan or semi-pagan government is continually enlarging; and the promise of its continuing to do so rests largely on its being occupied to its fullest limits by both parties. The occupation of this ever-increasing common ground by progressive and thoroughgoing Christians is the process by which the Saviour's promise that the gentle should inherit the earth is being progressively fulfilled.

12. But now, what of the future? What sort of *practical developments* are we hoping and working for? We do not rule out a priori the apocalyptic idea that, by an unusual display of Divine power the Kingdom of God will come some day all of a sudden. Only we cannot engineer, or even calculate upon, such a blessed consummation. Confining ourselves to the more normal methods and principles of human progress, we desire and expect :—

firstly, a re-awakening of all Christians throughout the Church to the true meaning of the Christian ethic on the subject we have been discussing;

secondly, an increase in the numbers and a healing of the divisions of the Church throughout the world;[1]

thirdly, along with this intensive and extensive growth of Christianity, an enhanced influence and power of Christians over the lives of their still-unconverted fellow-men—such an influence and power as was foreshadowed by

[1] Mt xiii. 31–33; Mc xiii. 10, xiv. 9 ||s. On 'reunion,' cf Mc ix. 38–40 ||.

Jesus when he called his followers the salt of the earth,[1] the light of the world,[2] fishers of men,[3] labourers in God's harvest,[4] invested with authority to bind and loose,[5] conquerors of evil-spirits,[6] servants entrusted with authority,[7] rulers of their master's cities,[8] judges of the twelve tribes of Israel,[9] and finally, inheritors, i.e. masters, of the earth [10];

fourthly, the ultimate abolition of war by the simple refusal of an ever-increasing number of influential people to have anything to do with it. The growing good sense of politicians, expressing itself through some such scheme as the League of Nations, may help to diminish the number and the likelihood of wars; but this method of prevention, though apparently speedy, is not really sufficient, inasmuch as the League itself contemplates and provides for wars against recalcitrant nations. The steady growth of personal Christian pacifism, so far from

[1] Mt v. 13.

[2] Mt v. 14–16: not like the Pharisees, "blind leaders of the blind" (Mt xv. 14 ||). Cf Rom ii. 17–20 for Paul's beautiful, but half ironical, description of the function of leadership ("a guide to the blind, a light to them that are in darkness," etc), to which the religious Jew aspired.

[3] Mc i. 17 ||s.

[4] Mt ix. 37 f ||; Jn iv. 35–38.

[5] Mt xvi. 18–19, xviii. 18. The statement in the first of these verses that the gates of Hades will not hold back Jesus' church (reading *κατίσχουσιν αὐτήν* for *κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς*; see Hitchcock in *The Expositor*, October 1919, pp. 307 f) may be taken as alluding to the irrepressible influence of the Christian society.

[6] Mc vi. 7 ||s, ix. 38 f ||; Lc x. 17–20: cf Mt vii. 22.

[7] Mt xxiv. 45–51 ||, xxv. 21, 23, 28 f: cf v. 19, xi. 11 ||.

[8] Lc xix. 17, 19 ||.

[9] Lc xxii. 28–30; Mt xix. 28.

[10] Mt v. 5.

being, as Dr. H. E. Fosdick contemptuously calls it, one of those "panaceas so pitiably inadequate that no one who knows the problem could believe in them,"[1] is the only really radical solution of the problem of war.

fifthly, the ever-increasing participation of non-resisting Christians in all the beneficent activities of the State and other public bodies, this process being in essence the progressive identification of Church and State, the progressive realization of the Kingdom of God in human society, the progressive doing of God's Will on earth as it is done in heaven. "The kingdoms of this world must become the Kingdom of Christ. It is not enough for the State to be Christian in theory or in motive; the State as an enforced organisation must itself pass away before we can ever have peace. The State must disappear within the Church. This not only demands that all people shall first be Christians, but that they shall be such Christians as the world has never[2] yet seen, realising the Presence of Christ more vividly than that of any visible person; more expert in learning His will than in discovering the laws of nature; more obedient to His authority than to any authority based on the compulsion of force, the reward of position, or the bribe of wealth. It must be acknowledged the coming of such a Kingdom seems very remote."[3] But however

[1] *The Challenge of the Present Crisis*, p. 68.
[2] I should prefer to say 'rarely' (C. J. C.).
[3] Orchard, *The Necessity of Christ*, p. 119.

remote it may seem, much has been gained if we have succeeded, not only in visualizing it as a distant ideal,

> The one far-off, divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves,

but in discerning the path by which it may be approached, and in discovering the course to be pursued by each individual in order to bring this suffering human race nearer and nearer to its true goal.

INDEX OF NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES REFERRED TO

For an index to the subject-matter the reader is referred to the full "Table of Contents" at the beginning of the book. In using the Index of Passages given here, it should be borne in mind that a verse which does not appear in its place in the list may yet be duly dealt with in connection with its parallel in another Gospel.

Printed in Great Britain by

UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED

WOKING AND LONDON

God and Personality

By CLEMENT C. J. WEBB, M.A.

Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen College, Oxford

Demy 8vo. *Second Impression* 12*s.* 6*d. net*

Divine Personality and Human Life

Being Part II of "God and Personality"

By CLEMENT C. J. WEBB, M.A.

Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen College, Oxford

Demy 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d. net*

"There are few writers in whom one has greater confidence as regard fullness and thoroughness of knowledge, sanity of judgment, and a clea appreciation of the place which the Christian revelation should hold i a serious estimate of man's relation to the universe. Mr. Webb may b assured that of the many rich contributions that have recently been cas into the treasury of our thoughts about God and man, his will be regarde as not the least precious."—*Westminster Gazette.*

From Chaos to Catholicism

Demy 8vo. By Rev. W. G. PECK 8*s.* 6*d. net*

"Eloquent, forcible, sometimes brilliant, always admirably candid."
Christian World

God the Prisoner

And Other Lay Sermons

By HELEN WODEHOUSE, D.Phil.

Cr. 8vo. 5*s. net*

"With their mingled strength and sympathy they have an individuality which more than justifies their publication."—*Times.*

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD.

Cadoux, Cecil John, 1883-1947.
The guidance of Jesus for to-day; being a
account of the teaching of Jesus from the
standpoint of modern personal and social ne
New York, Doran, 1921.
178p. 19cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

1. Christian ethics. 2. Jesus Christ--
Teachings. I. Title.

CCSC/mmb